DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 562 UD 020 566

AUTHOR Tilis, Howard S.; Conde, Aquiles
TITLE Evaluation of the 1978-79 United States Elementary and Secondary Education Act--Title I and Impact Aid Programs in Community School District 6, New York, N.Y.
INSTITUTION Community School District 6, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Attitudes; *Compensatory Education; Diagnostic Teaching; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Federal Programs; Individualized Instruction; Junior High Schools; *Mathematics Instruction; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; *Remedial Programs; Spanish Speaking; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Impact Aid; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

The following programs funded under Title I and Impact Aid and implemented in New York City's Community School District 6 are evaluated in this report: (1) the Program for Corrective Reading for eligible students in grades 3-6; (2) the Junior High School Reading Lab Program; (3) Project Striver, designed to provide supplementary reading instruction to pupils in grades 4, 5, and 6; (4) the Math Laboratory Program for the elementary and junior high levels and a supplementary Math Lab Impact Aid program; (5) an English as a Second language (ESL) program for Spanish speaking students in grades 3-9; (6) Project Success, and intensive reading and mathematics program for severely educationally retarded students in grades 4-7; (7) a non public school component which operated in four parochial schools for eligible students in grades 1-8. For each component, the goals and target population are described, evaluation procedures are reviewed, program activities are outlined, and student achievement data are presented. The results of questionnaires administered to teachers, paraprofessionals and principals are also included in the report. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

APR 2 9 1980

BOARD OF EDUCATION
COMMUNITY SCHOOL BOARD
DISTRICT 6, MANHATTAN

Mr. Ernst Lilienstein
President
Mrs. Gwenn Crenshaw
Vice President
Mr. David Dubnau
Secretary
Rabbi Abraham Pinter
Treasurer
Mrs. Dorothy Hart
Mrs. Hadassah Hersh
Mrs. Isabel Navarro
Rev. Robert Ritchie
Prof. Leonard Strauss
Mrs. Gladys Guzman
Executive Assistant

ED186562

EVALUATION OF THE 1978-79 UNITED STATES ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT - TITLE I AND IMPACT AID PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 6 NEW YORK, N.Y.

PROGRAM FOR CORRECTIVE READING	5043-91622
READING LAB FOR J.H.S.	5043-91623
PROJECT STRIVER	5043-91624
MATHEMATICS LABORATORY	5043-91625
MATH LAB IMPACT AID	5043-98722
ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE	5043-91626
PROJECT SUCCESS	5043-91627
NON PUBLIC SCHOOLS - READING	5043-91628
E.S.L.	5043-91629
MATH	5043-91630

By

Howard S. Tilis
Director
Research, Evaluation and Testing

Aquiles Conde
Assistant Director
Research, Evaluation and Testing

Paul Treatman
Community Superintendent

James P. Roberts
Deputy Superintendent
Curriculum and Instruction

Armetta M. Cossingham
Director
Funded Programs

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Edmonds
New York City Board of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

November 1979

665 WEST 182nd STREET / NEW YORK, N.Y. 10033 / TEL. 690-8926

CD020566

EVALUATION OF THE 1978-79
UNITED STATES ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION ACT - TITLE I AND
IMPACT AID PROGRAMS IN
COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 6
NEW YORK, N.Y.

Program For Corrective Reading	5043-91622
Reading Lab For J.H.S.	5043-91623
Project Striver	5043-91624
Mathematics Laboratory	5043-91625
Math Lab Impact Aid	5043-98722
English As A Second Language	5043-91626
Project Success	5043-91627
Non Public Schools - Reading	5043-91628
E.S.L.	5043-91629
Math	5043-91630

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation of any program as massive as this requires the cooperation of many individuals. These many individuals understood the need of the evaluation team to be completely independent in order ot provide an unbiased assessment of the Title I programs in District 6. In particular, I would especially like to aknowledge the continuous cooperation and support of Mrs. Armetta M. Cossingham, Director of Funded Programs, Mrs. Elizabeth Pruger, Coordinator of Reading, Mrs. Michele Jones, Coordinator of the Corrective Reading Program, Mr. Al Grab, Coordinator of Math, Mrs. Natalia Miller, Coordinator of ESL and Sister James David, Coordinator of the Non-Public School Programs. All of these individuals made the varied functions of the evaluation team easier. These are truly professional people.

Also acknowledged is the faithful cooperation of the individual principals, teachers, educational assistance and the children in the compilation of this report. We applaud and appreciate their assistance in enduring the testing programs and sometimes unscheduled site visits.

To Dr. Paul Treatman, Community Superintendent and Mr. James P. Roberts, Deputy Superintendent we offer our thanks for the freedom of professional inquiry. This is the type of atmosphere necessary to generate useful evaluative information.

Finally, but by no means last, we would like to extend my thanks and appreciation to Dr. Mark S. Brown, Mr. Michael Greeley, Mrs. Sara Lee and Mrs. Beatrice Bildner who performed major tasks as part of the evaluation team. Dr. Brown had major responsibilities for the reading, math and ESL programs; Mr. Greeley also had major responsibilities for reading and math; Mrs. Sara Lee performed portions of the evaluation for Project Success; and Mrs. Beatrice Bildner who had responsibilities for some portions of the reading and math components. I would like to extend my appreciation to them for a job professionally done.

It is with sincere gratitude that I offer my thanks to Ms. Yolanda Cesario for the herculean job of typing this evaluation report under extreme pressure.

INTRODUCTION

There has been much written since the beginning of ESEA, Title I in 1965 of the value of program evaluation. The reality, we are told, is that evaluation has had little influence on the educational decision-making process and that evaluation information is largely ignored (Alking & Daillak, 1979). We are told by Rossi (1972) of the technical, organizational, and political hazards and pitfalls which impede effective evaluation. We all know what evaluation should do, we also know that the process, in many cases, has not always been successful for reasons obvious and too numerous to discuss in this "age of accountability".

As is required of all Title I programs, District 6 was mandated to conduct an evaluation of its' Title I effort. A detailed report, including observations, interviews, questionnaire data, and test data serves only to bolster the positive impact of the Title I effort. I believe that each individual school program can serve as a model for teaching reading, nath and ESL to all children. I believe that the philosophy and methodology of a diagnostic-prescriptive approach is applicable across the whole spectrum of individual differences.

I urge you, do not let this evaluation report be one that is not utilized. Review these data and give your considered judgments of how these successful models may be generalized to all children. These data demonstrate that Title I does make a difference. The program can only serve a small portion of the district's students, see how it may be extended to others as part of a continuing obligation to educate all children.

Alkin, M.C. and Daillak, R.H. "A Study of Evaluation Utilization" Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1979, 1 (4), 41-49.

Rossi, P.H. Booby Traps and Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Social Action Programs. In C.H. Weiss (Ed.), Evaluation Action Programs: Reading in Social Action and Education.

PROGRAM FOR CORRECTIVE READING
(5043-91622)

THE PROGRAM: A DESCRIPTION

The Program for Corrective Reading was designed to prevent reading failure and to improve competency in reading by providing a diagnostic/presciptive teaching program for Title I eligible pupils in grades 3 through 6.

The programmatic design was essentially one which identified pupils in need of supplementary instruction of a corrective or remedial nature, diagnosed their specific needs, and provided intensive systematic instruction in line with the individual profile of diagnosed needs.

This instruction was supplementary to the basic tax-levy reading program in each of the Title I eligible schools.

Diagnosis was on-going and participants were involved in their own goal setting.

Activities to be provided by the Corrective Reading team would be tailored to meet the instructional needs of participants at various intervention levels. Particular attention was to be given to instructional strategies to develop initial and concomitant developmental reading skills in:

-concept and language development
-perceptual skills
-visual memory skills
-decoding skills
-oral and silent reading skills
-comprehension skills
-word-study skills

The target population was defined as those Title I eligible students in grades 3 through 6 who demonstrated the greatest need for remedial reading services as determined by their performance on the April, 1977 administration of the New York City Reading Test.

Students received individual and/or small group (10-15 students) instruction 4 or 5 times per week. All instruction was provided by the Corrective Reading team in a room designated as a reading laboratory. Each child received specific skill instruction based on his/her diagnostic/prescriptive profile. Appropriate materials, suited to a child's particular mode of learning, were selected for instruction.

All Corrective Reading Teachers (CRT) were to teach a total of 28, forty-five minute periods per week servicing 75-82 students. Each group met 4-5 periods each week. In addition, the CRT spent one period per week providing paraprofessional training and one period was used for conferences with tax-levy classroom teachers and the RIMS resouce teacher.

At each of the ten (10) Title I elementary schools, 150 students in grades 3 through 6 participated in the program. The total number of program participants that were directly serviced by the Corrective Reading component was 1500 students.

Each of the 10 schools participating in this component had two teachers and two educational assistants assigned on a full-time basis. Generally, one teacher and one educational assistant (known as a CRT team) was responsible for grades 3 and 4 and the other CRT team, grades 5 and 6.

On-site supervision of the CRT program was the responsibility of each school principal or assistant principal. Overall coordination of the entire program was the responsibility of the Coordinator of the Program for Corrective Reading at the District level.

EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

The evaluation design for the Program for Corrective Reading specified both process and product evaluation. Formal evaluation of the Program for Corrective Reading began in November, 1978. The evaluation focused on the degree to which the program objectives were implemented. Process evaluation procedures included at least three site visits to the 10 schools participating in the program. Methods for this evaluation study were as follows:

1. Direct observation of the instructional activities of the program.
2. Interviews were conducted with the Director of Funded Programs, and the Title I Reading Coordinator. Additional personnel interviewed included principals and assistant principals as well as the 20 Title I teachers and the 20 Educational Assistants who directly worked in the program.
3. Evaluation of curriculum and materials used in the Program for Corrective Reading.
4. Discussion with pupils regarding their participation in the program.
5. The collection and analysis of achievements data, the results of which are included in this report.

The design that constituted product evaluation for the Program in Corrective Reading was as follows:

AREA OF BEHAVIORAL CHANGE	DEGREE OF CHANGE	REFERENCE
In reading skills grades 3-6.	the target population will demonstrate achievement beyond expectation (p=.05)	As measured by the appropriate level of the (SAT)

SAMPLING PLAN

The total treatmat group was comprised of all students who had participated in the program for Corrective Reading and who had been tested on pre/post basis.

A 100% sample was selected

Test Schedules:

Pretest: October, 1978 - SAT/Form, B
Posttest: May, 1979 - SAT/Form, B

Instruments:

Grade	Pretest	Postest
3	Primary II-Form B	Primary II-Form B
4	Primary III-Form B	Primary III-Form B
5	Intermediate I-Form B	Intermediate I-Form B
6	Intermediate II-Form B	Intermediate II-Form B

All sub-tests in the reading portion were administered on both the pretest and the posttest.

DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis of data was accomplished via the historical regression method. On the basis of scores drawn form the October, 1978 administration of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Form B, anticipated or predicted posttest scores were developed. These predicted posttest scores were then used for comparison with the actual posttest scores drawn from the May, 1979 administration of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), from B. The null hypothesis tested was that there was no significant difference between the predicted posttest scores and the actual posttest scores. The test data was analyzed by use of a t-test.

FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

OBSERVATION OF PROGRAM AND REVIEW OF RECORDS

The Program for Corrective Reading provided supplemental reading instruction to 1,596 Title I eligible program participants in grades 3 through 6 at the 10 Title I elementary schools in District 6. The program was staffed by 20 teachers and 20 educational assistants. Two teachers and two educational assistants were assigned to each of the 10 schools. At each school site, one teacher and one educational assistant constituted a

"Corrective Reading Team". One team provided remedial services to program participants at grade levels 3 and 4 while the other "Team" provided intervention at the 5th and 6th grade levels.

On-site visitations and observations of the CRTS revealed that a diagnostic-prescriptive approach was designed and implemented as the basic methodology of the program. The approach consisted of a careful diagnosis of individual needs, preparation of pupil profiles that reflected these needs, and the planning and implementation of an intensive, systematic prescriptive program to remediate these deficiencies. All CRTS provided 28 periods of direct instruction to the target population weekly. Two additional periods were also incorporated into each program. One period was used for paraprofessional training and the other to allow for regular conferencing with tax-levy teachers to discuss the needs of particular students. This period was also used to meet with the RIMS resource teacher. An examination of teachers' records revealed that three distinct patterns of conferencing were developed.

1. Scheduled conferences with tax-levy teachers that were documented with conference notes.
2. Informal conferences with tax-levy teachers during lunch periods, prep periods, or before or after school.
3. Little or no articulation with tax-levy teacher.

The method most often observed was regularly scheduled conferences with tax-levy teachers that were documented with conference notes. Sixteen (16) of the 20 CRTS maintained logs of conferences with tax-levy teachers. The remaining 4 CRTS reported that conferences with tax-levy teachers did occur on an informal basis. The evaluator did observe this mode of articulation being utilized by 2 of the CRTS .

Interviews with both CRTS and RIMS resource teachers, confirmed that all CRT's and RIMS resource teachers conferred regularly. In general, from an organizational vantage point, it appears the program was implemented as specified in the program proposal.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

A review of program participants' folders indicated that records were kept for each child. The Pupil Profile Form indicated the strengths and weaknesses of each child.

All participants were "pulled-out" of the regular tax-levy classroom for remedial instruction 4-5 times weekly. Each period of instruction, 45 minutes in length, was provided by the Corrective Reading teacher in a room designated as a reading laboratory. This instruction was supplementary to reading instruction provided in the classroom setting.

The size of each group receiving instructions was 10-14 with most groups averaging about 11 students.

The instructional climate repeatedly observed in the Corrective Reading Labs was excellent. The labs presented a positive-learning environment for

the program participants. The evaluation team, after numerous visits to all of the labs, attributed this positive environment to be the result of careful planning and insightful teaching procedures.

The instructional materials observed in use in the Corrective Reading labs indicated that a wide variety of materials were available and were being utilized to provide appropriate remedial instruction. All labs in this component had a wealth of material at their disposal. The materials were well-suited to the age and maturity of pupils. In addition, the level of materials being utilized were appropriate to the reading ability of the program participants. In 14 of the labs observed, a clear differentiation was made between instructional level and independent level materials. The wide range of materials available afforded teachers the opportunity to present the same skill in a variety of ways (ie. present instruction in the learning modality best suited to each student's needs.)

Once again, it can be definitively stated that the program activities provided by this component were in consonance with what was stated in the program proposal.

ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Analysis of the pre- and posttest Stanford Achievement Tests for the Corrective Reading Program shows that for each of grades 3-6 there was substantial growth from pre- to posttest (see Table 1). At grade 3 the growth was 8 months, at grade 4, 1.1 years, grade 5, 1.2 years, and at grade 6, 1.5 years. The magnitude of this exceptional growth is highlighted by the fact that children at grade 3 were 1.2 years below grade level expectation at the time of pretesting, children at grade 4, 1.5 years below, children at grade 5, 2.3 years below, and children at grade 6, 2.2 years below grade level expectation. Although the children are still achieving below grade level after posttesting, the participation in the Title I program has provided an opportunity to grow at greater than 1 month for each 1 month basis. The program has allowed the children to narrow the gap of reading retardation so that the children are slowly beginning to approach grade level expectations.

Table 1 also provides additional information concerning reading growth which might be expected, based on pretest score and grade level placement. A statistical analysis was performed on "growth" which may be predicted based on one's previous history of achievement and number of years in school.

In all instances, at grades 3-6, the actual posttest grade equivalent score was significantly greater than that which would be predicted from the pretest score. In other words, if there were no Title I intervention, it would have been predicted that the children's reading achievement would be significantly lower.

A review of the subtest date at grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 also show significant growth from pre- to posttest, as well as significant differences between predicted posttest and actual posttest. As can be seen in Table 2, at grades 3, 4, and 5, reading comprehension and word recognition exhibited a higher

TABLE 1

PRE- & POSTTEST RESULTS OF THE S.A.T. - TOTAL SCORE

FOR THE CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

Grade	N	Pretest	Post	Growth	Pred. Post.	T-Value Post vs. Pred.	Significance
3	325	2.0	2.8	+ .8	2.4	5.00	$<.01$
4	449	2.7	3.8	+1.1	3.2	12.85	$<.01$
5	370	2.9	4.1	+1.2	3.4	6.36	$<.01$
6	398	4.0	5.5	+1.5	4.6	6.92	$<.01$

TABLE 2

PRE AND POSTTEST RESULTS OF THE SAT - SUBTEST SCORES

FOR THE CORRECTIVE READING PROGRAM

	Vocabulary		Comprehension		Word Recognition	
Grade	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
3	1.8	2.6	2.0	2.9	2.0	2.9
4	2.3	2.9	2.9	3.9	2.6	3.9
5	2.8	3.6	3.0	4.3	2.7	4.3
6	4.0	4.7	4.1	5.3	4.1	5.7

12

13

grade equivalent score at posttest than did vocabulary. At grade 6 word recognition was higher than both reading comprehension and vocabulary.

It is important to note that the vocabulary subsection pretest, and particularly, posttest score is lower than either of the other subtests. This is primarily a positive reflection of the emphasis of the reading philosophy of the program. The program basically operates on the premise that comprehension skills are the ones to be concentrated on, since the end product of the reading process is a clear understanding of what one has read.

It is a well-known axiom in education that in order for a child to learn, it is necesssary to participate in the learning process. Keeping this in mind, this last school year, information was collected concerning the number of hours of instruction in the Title I reading component, as well as some fairly good estimates of the number of hours of reading instruction the child received as part of the tax-levy obligation. These data, in light of the positive results obtained in the Title I Corrective Reading Program, may provide some guidelines for the number of hours of instruction necessary for growth in reading achievement.

The children in grades 3-6 received Title I reading instruction for an average of 4 days per week, 45 minutes per day. The program averaged about 21 weeks in length and the children had about 70 hours of instruction in the Title I Corrective Reading Program; they also received about 178 hours of reading instruction in the regular classroom program.

These figures do not address the quality of instruction, but they do suggest some structure for how often children should be cycled through the Title I Corrective Reading Program.

We do not mean to suggest by these data, that if one were to double or even triple the number of hours of reading instruction in both the Title I component and tax-levy program that there would be a corresponding growth. We do not think that this would be the case; there must be some point of "maximum return", wherein the "quality" of instruction becomes the determining factor.

Although we do not have any definitive information relating classroom instruction behavior to achievement results, we believe that we have provided some organizational data to allow one to structure an effective Title I reading program.

TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

In order to determine the perception or feelings of teachers toward the program, they were requested to complete an anonymous questionnare.

Fifteen teachers responded to this questionnaire. Seventy nine percent (79%) of this population were at the Masters level, fourteen percent (14%) had achieved doctorates. The experiential background represents many years of teaching, from ten to thirty-one, at an average of 17.5. Sixty-seven (67%) percent had been in Title I reading for three or more years, and over half

had participated in previous special programs.

All teachers indicated they were within the guidelines in terms of the number of periods taught per week and the frequency with which each group is provided services. Sixty percent have other duties in the school (lunch or yard). This is confirmed by observation of the program.

Almost all of the respondents selected children primarily on NYC Reading Test scores.

Table 3 shows ratings of some aspects of the program. Most often components were rated in the direction of "very effective." Execptions related to fiscal access for teachers, cooperation from other school personnel, training workshops, physical facilities, and pupil grouping practices. These components showed a distribution of ratings across low to high points on the scale. Several student-related components clearly reflected teachers' perception of minimal effectiveness, with approximately half the teachers rating these "3": motivation and performance. Also, coordination with tax levy teachers illustrated an area of concern. Of interest in relation to these last items, were the highest rating for Title I staff performance and for student interest in the program. Title I staff seem to have reached consensus on their own abilities even with minimal formal tax levy involvement. (The District liaisons are also perceived quite positively.) Also, in somewhat of a contradiction to student performance ratings their interest in being part of the "pull-out" program is regarded as high.

Most frequently noted materials used in the classroom were Barnell Lofts, Cambridge Skillbooster, SRA, Lowell and Lynwood, Croft Skillpacks, Random House Skill pacers, and Troll Readalongs.

In probing the relationship with tax levy teachers, the most common contacts were through monthly meetings to discuss child progress. Informal "hallway" conversations were really the context for most exchanges. Recommendations were for more cooordination of specific planning in areas of vocabulary and skill building. More frequent formal conferences, with information recorded for prescriptive planning for students was suggested, as was the need for meeting to reach consistent criteria for program eligibility and placement procedures.

Pre and posttesting received specific critiques: return data sooner; continue using same forms for pre and post; better training on interpretation of computer printout; retrieving data from diagnostics to eliminate duplication.

Regarding training, two thirds refer to personnel educational preparation as most significant. Only half the respondents answered the question of additional training, specifying areas of clerical management, and student diagnosis.

As found in last year's survey, all teachers believe their instructional practices were best characterized as "individualized" or "small group".

Regarding improved effectiveness, (#19) sixty percent failed to respond, and others noted "more time" and "too much clerical work" as the usual

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION: "HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM." BY CORRECTIVE READING TEACHERS

Aspects of the Program	Very Ineffective 1	2	Somewhat Effective 3	4	Very Effective 5
a. Amount of financial resources available	-	6%	33%	47%	13%
b. Ease of access to those funds	6%	6%	53%	27%	6%
c. Variety of materials available	-	6%	27%	47%	27%
d. Amounts of materials available	-	-	27%	47%	27%
e. The organization of staff	-	13%	6%	40%	33%
f. Staff spirit or morale	-	13%	13%	40%	27%
g. Quality of staff performance	-	-	13%	40%	40%
h. Administration	-	-	40%	40%	13%
i. Student interest	-	-	33%	67%	-
j. Student motivation	-	-	47%	47%	6%
k. Student performance	-	6%	47%	47%	-
l. Cooperation from other school personnel	-	20%	40%	27%	13%
m. Selection procedures for pupils in the	-	33%	20%	33%	-
n. Physical Facilities	6%	20%	33%	6%	33%
o. Time allotted for pupils receiving instruction	-	6%	33%	33%	27%
p. Number of pupils in each group	6%	13%	33%	40%	6%
q. Coordination with tax levy program	-	6%	53%	27%	13%
r. Monthly Workshops	-	20%	27%	27%	27%
s. "pull-out" program	-	6%	20%	27%	40%
t. District office staff liaisons	-	6%	13%	47%	33%

obstacles. (This question tends to elicit less information than other related items.)

Table 4 illustrates teacher priorities for the educational assistants' duties and responsibilities. Frequency of ranks has been averaged. As is seen, individual and group work are perceived as the primary function of the E.A., while assessment, parent communication, and presentation of new material are most definitely the job of the teacher

TABLE 4

C.R. TEACHERS PRIORITIES OF ACTIVITIES OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS

Avg. Rank	Activities
3.9	Review what the teacher has taught
3.0	Drill on specific skills
7.0	Present new material
+2.4	Work with individual children
+1.5	Work with a small group of children
4.5	Grading the daily work of children
8.4	Acting as a liaison between the teacher and parents
4.5	Planning activities with the teacher
5.7	Performing clerical duties
8.7	Administering tests
7.3	Correcting tests

Nine of the fifteen teachers noted no revisions or adaptations to the program. Several commented that size of groups depended on phsysical constraints, and that selection procedures, not screening specific LD problems caused some confusion of objectives.

The major strengths of the program, in rank order, were: ability to focus on individual needs; "pull-out" nature of program; well trained E.A.'s: materials; rapport among staff and administrators. Weaknesses included paperwork; physical plant; size of groups. Regarding assessment, teachers favored informal testing by and with own instruments, conferences with students, criterion reference testing, individual profile sheets, and SRA, Croft, and Series R achievement tests.

Finally, program modifications would consist of availability of smaller groups; better paraprofessional training; less absenteeism of staff and students; better coordination of RIMS, tax levy and Title I.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM? BY EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS

Aspect of the Program	Very Ineffective 1	2	Somewhat Effective 3	4	Very Effective 5
a. Variety of materials available	-	-	-	54%	46%
b. Sufficient amounts of materials available	-	-	7.6%	62%	31%
c. The organization of staff	-	-	7.6%	38%	54%
d. Staff spirit or morale.	-	7.6%	-	38%	54%
e. Quality of staff performance	-	-	7.6%	38%	54%
f. Administration	-	7.6%	7.6%	62%	62%
g. Student interest	-	-	23%	62%	23%
h. Student motivation	-	-	23%	62%	15%
i. Student performance	-	-	23%	62%	15%
j. Cooperation from school administration	-	7.6%	15%	46%	31%
k. Selection procedures for pupils in the program	-	-	31%	46%	23%
l. Phsycial facilities	15%	7.6%	7.6%	31%	38%
m. Time allotted for pupils receiving instruction	-	-	31%	38%	31%
n. Number of pupils in each group	-	7.6%	31%	38%	15%
o. Diagnostic evaluation	-	-	31%	46%	23%
p. Coordination with tax-levy program	7.6%	-	38%	38%	15%
q. Monthly workshops/ para-teacher training session	-	-	7.6%	69%	23%

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS QUESTIONNAIRE

Of the thirteen paraprofessionals in Corrective Reading over 90% have had previous experience. Educational backgrounds vary with the majority having some college, and two with bachelor degrees. Most, however are not presently enrolled in coursework related to their present position.

Table 5 illustrates E.A. perceptions of various components of the program. Only physical facilities show a negative perception. In general, E.A.'s perceptions are skewed to the highest end of the scale. In agreement with teachers, the assistants feel very positive about Title I staff organization, morale, and quality. Assistants are somewhat more "generous" in their perceptions about student motivation and performance. Further, their perceptions of tax-levy coordination share similar concerns. Supportiveness was demonstrated for the diagnostic component and for selection procedures for students in contrast to teacher ratings. Finally, high endorsement of monthly workshops was found, independent of the fact that some teachers believed these were less effective for paraprofessional's development.

Table 6 presents the paraprofessionals own ranked priorities for job responsibilities.

TABLE 6

RATING OF E.A. OF THEIR JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

Avg. Rank	Activities
4.4	Review what the teacher has taught
2.6	Drill on specific skills
3.0	Present new material
3.2	Work with individual children
1.6	Work with a small group of children
5.2	Grading the daily work of children
10.4	Acting as a liaison between the teacher and parents
5.6	Planning activities with the teacher
5.7	Performing clerical duties
7.3	Administering tests
7.8	Correcting tests

Clearly, E.A.'s rank working with small groups as the most salient feature of their role. Even work with individual children to which teachers responded with an average rank of 2.4, is given a self rating of 3.2. On the other hand drill on specific skills is ranked higher (2.6). All other areas of responsibility approximate teacher perceptions.

Among the strengths assessed by assistants were: individualized attention to special needs; working relationships with teachers. Weaknesses and recommendations followed the same pattern: groups too large; too many groups in one room; too much paper work and not enough lesson time.

In general, it was found that E.A.'s worked very conscientionsly in the program and they viewed their contribution to the program and the program in a positive light.

PRINCIPALS QUESTIONNAIRE

Eleven (11) principals responses were, in general, highly supportive of Title I reading programs. The major strengths cited by the principals were the opportunities for small group instruction and individualized techniques. Two specifically praised the diagnostic and prescriptive thrusts of the assessment guidelines. SAT evidence was noted as testimony to program effectiveness over past years. Multimedia and diversified materials were also included.

Essential in the program were staff experience and teamwork. District support to staff development is a component of this success. Less frequently cited as strengths were the "pull-out" nature of the program and the coordination with tax levy teachers. In fact, these last two aspects were noted a specific weaknesses (in agreement with some of the teaching staff). Record keeping and paperwork were seen to dilute program effectiveness. Two principals were concerned with the same children in Reading Labs year after year. Also, sharing the sense of other staff, administrators saw gaps in the student selection process which did not distinguish students with learning disabilities from those who needed remediation in reading.

Concern was evidenced in teachers overloading groups with more than ten students. Finally, at least one respondent was concerned with the drain of excellent teachers from regular classroom contact into specialized funded programs.

Improvements suggested ranged from logistical (more personnel; minimum of five group contact periods/week; staff ratios) to curricular (library component, writing). Several comments were aimed at assessment. These included suggestions for extensive criterion-referenced testing systems, improvement of existing instruments for individual progress reporting, increased reliance on teacher judgment. Tax-levy coordination appeared as a goal among several, as well as articulation between all funded programs. Reduction of paperwork, and more paraprofessional training rounded out recommendations and echoed teacher comments.

It is believed by the evaluation team that these comments by the Principals are very relevant and should be studied.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PROGRAM FOR CORRECTIVE READING

The following observations, conclusions and recommendations are made on the basis of the performance of the Program for Corrective Reading during the 1978-79 school year.

1. A full recycling of this highy successful program in the Title I umbrella for the 1979-80 school year.
2. Continued articulation of the Corrective Reading teachers with tax-levy and RIMS resource personnel should again be stressed.
3. Serious consideration should be given to reducing the number of children serviced by each of the Corrective Reading teachers. No more than 8 children should be serviced during any one instructional period. It is suggested that the total number of program participants that receive service by the CRT be about 65.
4. Monthly training sessions should explore, in-depth, the process of individualization and the effective use of management techniques. Mastery of these two areas would greatly enhance the effectiveness of the program.
5. Continued district support should be provided by maintaining the position of Coordinator for the Program for Corrective Reading. This position, created during the 1978-79 school year proved most beneficial in facilitating the effective functioning of this component.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL READING LAB PROGRAM
(5043-91623)

THE PROGRAM: A DESCRIPTION

The Junior High School Reading Lab Program recognizes the need for competency in reading and reading-related skills as crucial to academic success at the intermediate (IS. 164) and junior high school (JHS 52 and 143) levels.

To meet this need, a program of remedial instruction was instituted at I.S. 164, J.H.S. 52 and J.H.S. 143. The Junior High School Reading Lab Program serviced a total 943 pupils in the 3 schools. Program services were provided for grades 7,8,9, at J.H.S. 52 and J.H.S. 143, and grades 6-8 at IS. 164.

The total staff assigned to the Junior High School Reading Lab program consisted of 9 Title I reading lab teachers and 27 Educational Assistants. At each of the participating schools there were 3 reading labs. i.e. one reading lab per grade level. Full implementation of the program's activities was the responsibility of each Reading Lab team. Each team comprised one (1) Title I Reading teacher and three (3) Educational Assistants.

The program employed a diagnostic/precriptive approach to provide meaningful supplementary reading instruction. Small group and individualized instruction were incorporated into all instructional plans.

The design for the Junior High School reading program specified emphasis in the following reading activities: phonetic analysis, structural analysis, vocabulary development, comprehension, and study skills.

All program participants received small group instruction in the reading laboratory 3-5 times weekly. All labs were equipped with a wide range of mulit-media materials.

Each reading lab teacher provided 23 periods of direct instruction to his/her target population. The length of each instructional period was 45 minutes. One period a week was devoted to the training of the three (3) Educational Assistants that worked in the lab. A second period was allocated for conferences with tax-levy teachers and RIMS resource personnel. Each Junior High School Reading Lab teacher was responsible for servicing 100 children.

At each of the 3 schools participating in the program, each program teacher's target population of 100 participants was selected from a single grade level (i.e. grade 6,7,8, or 9).

Those students who demonstrated the greatest need for remedial reading services via their performance on the April 1978 administration of the New York City Reading Test were included in the program.

Students received individual and/or small group (15-20 students) instructions 3 or 4 times a week depending on their need. Instruction was based on clearly identified weakness. Individualized prescriptive teaching was employed.

On-site supervision was the responsibility of the principal or the assistant principal at each school. Overall responsibility for coordination of the program at the district level was the function of the Title I Reading Coordinator.

EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

Formal evaluation of the Junior High School Reading Lab program for the 1978-79 school year began in November, 1978. This evaluative study focused the degree to which the program objectives had been implemented. Evaluation procedures included both process and product evaluation. Methods employed in this evaluative study were as follows:

1. Direct observation of the instructional activities of the program.
2. Interviews conducted with the Director of Funded Programs, the Title I Reading Coordinator and the superisory staff at the 3 school directly involved in the program. Additional personnel interviewed were the 9 Title I Junior High Schools Reading Laboratory teachers and some of the Educationa Assistants assigned to the program. In addition, classroom (content-area) teachers were interviewed as were the 3 RIMS resource teachers.
3. Evaluation of curriculum and materials used in the Reading Lab program.
4. Discussion with program participants regarding their activities in the program.
5. The collection and analysis of achievement data the results of which are included in this report.

The design that constituted product evaluation for the Junior High School Reading Lab Program was as follows:

Area of Behavioral Change	Degree of Change	Reference
In reading skills grades 6,7,8,9	the target population will demonstrate achievement beyond expectation (p. .05)	as measured by the appropriate level of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT)

SAMPLING PLAN

The total treatment group was comprised of all students that had participated in the Junior High School Reading Lab Program and had been tested on a pre/post basis. A 100% sample was utilized.

TEST SCHEDULE

Pretest	October, 1978	SAT/Form B
Posttest	May, 1979	SAT/Form B

INSTRUMENTS

Grade	Pretest	Posttest
6	S.A.T.-Intermediate II-Form B	Intermediate II-Form B
7	S.A.T.-Advanced - Form B	Advanced - Form B
8	S.A.T.-Advanced - Form B	Advanced - Form B
9	S.A.T.-Advanced - Form B	Advanced - Form B

All subtest in the reading portion were administered at both prestest and the posttesting time.

DATA ANALYSIS PLAN

The analysis of data was accomplished via the historical regression method. On the basis of scores drawn form the October, 1978 administration of the Stanford Achievement Test, (Form B), anticipated or predicted posttest scores were developed. These predicted posttest scores were then used for comparison with the actual posttest scores drawn from the May, 1979 administration of the Stanford Achievement Test, Form B. The null hypothesis tested was that there was no significant difference between the predicted posttest scores and the actual posttest scores.

FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

A total of 943 students participated in the programmatic activities of the Junior High School Reading Lab Program during the school year.

The evaluation team made 3 visits to observe the program at each school. Visits were made in November, 1978, February, 1979 and May, 1979. Based on observation and interviews,it was found that the program was fully operative at the 3 sites. It was found that staff was utilized and employed as specified in the program proposal. One teacher and 3 E.A.'s were assigned to each grade level.

Direct observation and on-site interviews with supervisory, tax levy teachers, RIMS resource personnel and Title I Junior High School Reading Lab staff, as well as evaluation of the teaching methodolgies employed and the curriculum materials utilized indicated the program had been implemented successfully. The activities observed paralelled the program proposal.

The evaluation team observed that the Title I Reading Lab team was effective in providing and/or creating a positive learning environment that supported prescriptive teaching. The instruction was primarily provided through small group instruction. The size of each instructional group was 15-20 students with the averages being 17. The teacher worked with one group of students while the three Educational Assistants provided reinforcement and further assistance in mastering skills previously presented by the teacher.

All participants received instruction 3-4 periods per week. The length of each instructional period was 45 minutes. The Title I Reading Lab teachers utilized a wide variety of teaching strategies that were appropriate for

the student. These methodologies complemented and supplemented the tax-levy teacher's developmental program in Language Arts.

A review of teachers' records indicated that on-going assessment of pupil needs was integrated into the program. Teacher's lesson plans (both individual and group) reflected careful planning.

Although one tends to expect Junior High School to be quite departmentailzed, the evaluation team found this was not entirely true (as related to the Title I program). Title I teachers maintained a good to excellent rapport with their tax-levy collegues. Conferring with tax-levy teachers occurred regularly. Since both Junior High School 52 and 143 have a Language Arts department, dialogue occurred frequently within that environment. A similar situation existed at I.S. 164. At all 3 sites conference records with tax-levy teachers were maintained. Records also indicated that there was an on-going articulation maintained between Title I teachers and RIMS resource personnel. It is important to note that during the 1978-79 school year the Reading Coordinator continually stressed the importance of meeting, on a regular basis with RIMS personnel for the purpose of recording all skills acquisition data that the RIMS teacher had gathered regarding each target pupil's performance. Records Title I Reading Coordinator's suggestion.

This observation is not to be taken lightly; it is indicative of the importance the District has placed on the coordination of funded and tax-levy programs in order to attack the "learning problem" in some integrated fashion. It seems to be another indication of the critical function Title I personnel play in the total learning process in the District.

A wide variety of skill oriented materials were observed in use in the reading labs. The instructional hardware and software (i.e. EDL, Project Think, etc.) were most appropriate for providing meaningful instructional experiences for the program participants.

The major thrust of the small group activities concentrated on the development of critical thinking, word-attack skills, the various levels of comprehension, and study skills. The incorporation of a number of reading support systems afforded each teacher the opportunity totally individualize their program. In addition, it provided each program participant the opportunity to progress at his own learning rate.

ACHIEVEMENT TEST DATA

Table 7 below shows the analysis of the pre- and posttests of the Stanford Achievement Test for the J.H.S. Reading Labs. A review of th table indicates that the degree of reading retardation in the J.H.S. is more severe than at the elementary level at the start of the program. Children at grade 7 are 2.9 years below grade level expectation, children at grade 8, 3.3 years below grade level expectation and children at grade 9, 4.9 years below. The hypothesis of cumulative deficit seems to be prevalent here. Still,

after participation in the program, the growth from pre- to posttest seems to be phenomenal - children exhibited growth of 1.4, 1.7 and 1.7 at grades 7,8, and 9 respectively. Rather than showing a growth line which is basically negative in nature, the children, with the intervention of the Title I J.H.S. Reading Labs, showed far greater than expected growth. As a matter of fact, a t-test was performed between the child's actual pretest and the posttest which was predicted based on the pretest and grade level placement. The results of this t-test indicates a statistically significant difference at all grade levels. This data, again, reaffirms the position that Title I reading programs in District 6 do contribute to the development of reading growth; that the program can act as a catalyst to reversel the process of cumulative reading retardation.

Although the number of hours of reading instruction (i.e. both tax-levy and Title I) does seem to be less than in the elementary program, nevertheless, positive results are still demonstrated. Again, what the key ingredient of this apparent success is, is still not entirely clear; more work is necessary so that we may be able to understand the "mystery", and learn more of the interaction of child and teacher in the classroom. The evaluation process at the present time, unfortunately, even under the best of conditions, is unlikely to produce data (i.e. information) which can definitively pinpoint causual effect relationships.

Table 8 presents subtest grade equivalent scores for each grade level. These may prove rather informative to some.

TABLE 7
PRE & POSTTEST RESULTS OF THE S.A.T. - TOTAL SCORE
FOR THE J.H.S. READING LAB

Grade	N	Pretest	Post	Growth	Pred. Post.	t-Value Post. vs. Pred.	Significance
7	259	4.3	5.7	+1.4	4.8	5.30	$<.01$
8	267	4.9	6.6	+1.7	5.4	6.32	$<.01$
9	77	4.3	6.0	+1.7	4.6	2.03	$<.05$

TABLE 8
PRE & POSTTEST RESULTS OF THE S.A.T. - SUBTEST SCORES
FOR THE J.H.S. READING LABS

	Vocabulary		Comprehension	
Grade	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
7	4.8	5.9	4.5	5.9
8	5.6	5.9	5.2	7.1
9	5.3	5.9	4.3	5.4

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION: "HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM?" BY JHS READING LABS TEACHERS

Aspects of the Program	Very Ineffective 1	2	Somewhat Effective 3	4	Very Effective 5
a. Amount of financial resources available	0	0	2	3	2
b. Ease of access to those funds	1	1	0	3	2
c. Variety of materials available	0	0	3	2	2
d. Amounts of materials available	0	0	3	-	4
e. The organization of staff	0	0	1	1	5
f. Staff spirit or morale	0	0	2	1	4
g. Quality of staff performance	0	0	2	2	4
h. Administration	0	0	2	2	3
i. Student interest	0	0	1	2	3*
j. Student motivation	0	0	1	2	3
k. Student performance	0	1	-	3	2*
l. Cooperation from other school personnel	0	1	1	4	1
m. Selection procedures for pupils in the	1	1	2	3	-
n. Physical Facilities	0	1	0	2	4
o. Time allotted for pupils receiving instruction	2	0	0	2	3
p. Number of pupils in each group	0	0	1	0	6
q. Coordination with tax levy program	2	1	3	1	0
r. Monthly Workshops	0	0	4	3	0
s. "pull-out" program	1	1	1	2	2
t. District office staff liaisons	0	0	2	1	4

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Seven of 9 teachers returned completed questionnaires. Of these, six had already earned masters degrees and one was at the doctoral level. The total number of years teaching experience represented was 93 years, with an average tenure of 13.3 years in the classroom. Most participated in the reading labs for one or two years, with previous experience ranging from "Reading Through Arts" to "Prescription Learning". All teachers taught 23 or 24 periods a week and two thirds of the teachers had duties beyone the Title I responsibilities. The basis for student selection is the N.Y.C. Reading Test scores. In addition, teacher recommendations, and "individual needs" are considered. One can readily see that these teachers are very experienced by years of service and teaching in funded program previously. The questionnaire data also confirms observations that the program is being implemented as specified in the proposal (i.e. # of teaching periods).

Table 9 presents the summary of teacher ratings of the effectiveness of twenty program components. As is readily evidenced, all components showed generally positive perceptions. Materials, organization, spirit, grouping, and physical facilities were consistently rated highly by the majority of teachers.

The following materials appeared in the "top 3" of each respondent's list of best instructional materials:

Reading for concepts
SRA labs
IRA kit
Barnell Loft
Moti workbooks
EDL
Word pacer
Audio Q Vocab cards
Craig
Califone
BFA
Hoffman Reader

Regarding the coordination or supplementary programs tax levy teachers, most mentioned informal conferences and sharing (e.g. using RIMS profiles to make individual assignments, sharing diagnostic test results). Improvements were suggested and include meetings between Title I and entire tax-levy subject matter team; utilization of texts from subject areas and cooperative lesson planning or planning around units taught in tax levy class; more frequent conference opportunities. (Note: These objectives were backed up by observations and interviews with JHS tax levy and Title I teachers during the Spring. Many recommended formalizing interchanges).

TABLE 11

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS RATINGS JHS
READING LAB PROGRAM

Aspect of the Program	Very Ineffective 1	2	Somewhat Effective 3	4	Very Effective 5
a. Variety of materials available	8%	-	15%	15%	61%
b. Sufficient amounts of materials available	8%	15%	8%	8%	61%
c. The organization of staff	-	-	23%	8%	69%
d. Staff spirit or morale.	-	15%	-	15%	69%
e. Quality of staff performance	-	15%	8%	8%	61%
f. Administration	-	15%	15%	23%	46%
g. Student interest	-	-	30%	38%	30%
h. Student motivation	8%	-	38%	46%	8%
i. Student performance	-	8%	23%	54%	15%
j. Cooperation from school administration	-	-	8%	46%	46%
k. Selection procedures for pupils in the program	30%	-	23%	8%	30%
l. Phsycial facilities	-	8%	8%	8%	77%
m. Time allotted for pupils receiving instruction	8%	15%	15%	23%	38%
n. Number of pupils in each group	-	15%	8%	8%	69%
o. Diagnostic evaluation	8%	-	15%	46%	30%
p. Coordination with tax-levy program	15%	23%	8%	8%	46%
q. Monthly workshops/ para-teacher training session	-	15%	15%	8%	61%

Pre and posttesting was rarely seen as having any instructional advantages. Most often the timing of test administration was believed to be problematic, with examples of alternatives generated. Requests for simplified instructions, for specific tests aimed at "slow readers" were also found.

In response to the need for additional training, 60% pointed to graduate level course and increased opportunities for inservice for all lab personnel and supervisors. Increased contacts with other district labs was noted, as were opportunities for workshops in record management and for pre-class time organizing.

Sixty-six percent responded that individualization was the primary instructional mode - a figure that does not realistically match observations of primarily small group interaction. However, in all Title I programs the definition of individualization has not enjoyed consensus.

Most respondents found no problems with diagnostic procedures. Two teachers noted too much paperwork and "too short a test," respectively. Almost all teachers were generally satisfied with the effectiveness of the program, with negative comments centering around material needs - replacement or addition of text and workbooks.

Table 10 presents teacher perceptions of the role of the Educational Assistant. There seems to be a clearly defined distribution of duties: working withindividuals and small groups are most often seen as within the domain of E.A. while administering and correcting tests, acting as teacher/parent liaison clearly remain duties of the teacher.

TABLE 10
RANKING OF PERCEPTIONS OF E.A. ROLE BY JHS READING-LABS TEACHER

a.	Review	7	4	6	5	3	9
b.	Drill specifice skills	6	3	5	4	4	8
c.	New materials	8	8	4	2	6	10
d.	Work w/indiv. st.	3	1	1	3	2	1
e.	Work s/ sm. group	2	2	2	1	1	2
f.	Grading daily work	1	7	3	7	5	3
g.	Acting as teacher-parent liaison	9	11	8	-	11	-
g.	Planning activities with teacher	4	6	7	8	8	5
i.	Clerical duties	5	5	9	6	7	4
j.	Admin. tests	10	9	10	10	9	6
k.	Correcting tests	11	10	11	9	10	7

Few changes in the program were suggested by the teachers; however, a number of strengths were pointed out. Included were: individual attention, variety of materials, educational assistants, structure for learning, atmosphere, and student motivation.

Weaknesses cited included the following: the maintenance of daily logs, the restrictive nature of the selection process, increased contact time.

In measuring student achievement the following were frequently considered: oral reading, daily monitoring of comprehension, "check in/check out" tests, SAT pre/post, Study Skill Kits, SRA assessments, and Nelson assessments. Informal student observation and interaction indicated.

EDUCATION ASSISSTANTS QUESTIONNAIRE

Thirteen E.A.'s responded to this questionnaire. Of these 92% had previous E.A. experience and 54% indicated specifiv training relating to Reading Labs. Educational background included 61% high school graduates, 23% Associate Degree, and 15% some collge. Most respondents (77%) indicated no course work related to their present position.

Table 11 illustrates E.A. ratings for seventeen program components. Highest ratings are found regarding material diversity and abundance, staff organization and morale, physical facilities, grouping of students, and training. These ratings tend to parallel teachers' perceptions. Least effective componetns seemed to be selection procedures and coordination with tax levy teachers.

Educational Assistants viewed the major program strenths as small group instruction, encouragement of independent reading, diversified materials, structure for orderly learning. Weaknesses included lack of student work books, more time for staff conferences. The same concerns are reflected in suggestions for the futrue for selection procedures which distinguish behavioral problems from remediation. Thirty percent also indicated that "logs work" was not an effective procedure.

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

The concerns of the JHS principal regarding this program are similar to those cited by the responses to the CR program.

In general, the program was reviewed positively by the principals.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL READING LABORATORY PROGRAM

The following observations, conclusions, and recommendations are made on the basis of the performance of the Junior High School Reading Laboratory program during the 1978-79 school year.

1. A full recycling of this highly successful program in the Title I umbrella for the 1979-80 school year.
2. Continued articulation among the JHS Reading Lab teachers with tax-levy and RIMS resource personnel should again be stressed.
3. Serous consideration should be given to reducing the number of children serviced by each of the Junior High Reading Lab teachers. No more than 8 children should be serviced during any one instrucitonal period. It is suggested that the total number of program participants who receive service by the CRT be 65.
4. Monthly trainig sessions should explore in depth the process of individualization and effective use of management techniques. Mastery of these two areas would greatly enhance the effectiveness of the program.
5. Continued district support should be provided by maintaining the position of Coordinator for the Program for Coorective Reading. This position, created during 1978-1979 school year proved most beneficial in facilitating the effective functioning of this component.

PROJECT STRIVER
(5043-91624)

THE PROGRAM: A DESCRIPTION

Project Striver was intended to provide supplementary reading instruction to those Title I eligible pupils in grades 4,5 and 6 who were defined as marginal underachievers. Seventy-five (75) children from each of the 10 Title I schools in District were selected for the program. The total number of program participants was projected to be 750; the actual number who participated was 782.

The criteria for selection of program participants was as follows:
-Title I eligibility,
-presently a student in grades 4,5 or 6, and primarily
-reading achievement scores that fell between the 37th percentile and the 50th percentile as measured by the April 1978 administration of the New York City Reading Test.

-Reading achievement scores which identified a student as 1 to 9 months below grade level in reading achievement.

The Striver Program used a diagnostic/prescriptive model of isntruction. A variety ofinstructional techniques were employed to meet the individual and diverse needs of the target population. The programmatic activities were directed toward providing learning experiences that encouraged not only vertical but hoizontal expansion for th target child.

Project Striver personnel were to provide extensive experiences int he areas of word knowledge and voabualry acquistion. Instructional activities aimed at increasing vocabulary development were utilized. The cloze technique was used to further develop linguistic and comprehension skills. Comprehension skills were improved by use of contained readers, tach-x accompanying software. The contained reader provided a means of imcreasing pupils' reading rate.

Personnel assigned to Project Striver included 10 teachers and 10 education assistants. One team was assigned to each of 10 elementary schools in District 6. Each team was responsible for providing direct service to 75 Title I eligible program participants.

Students received small group (10-15) and/or individual instruction 4-5 times per week in a room designated as the reading laboratory. Each child received a thorough diagnosis of his reading abilities and prescriptive instruction was implemented. This instruction was correlated toidentified deficiencies.

Each Project Striver teacher taught 28 periods per week. The length of each period was 45 minutes. In addition the Striver teacher spent one period per week training his/her Educational Assistant and one period per

week holding conferences with tax-levy or RIMS resource personnel. All conferences were documented in a log maintained by the Striver teacher.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The evaluation of Project Striver specified both process and product evaluation. Formal evaluation of Project Striver began in November, 1978. The evaluation effort focused on the degree to which the program objectives were implemented. Process evaluation procedures included three rounds of site visits to the 10 schools participating in the program. Methods for this evaluation study were as follows:

1. Direct observation of the instructional aspects of the program.
2. Interviews conducted with the Director of Funded Programs and the Title I Reading Coordinator. Additional personnel interviewed included the principals and assistant principals as well as the 10 Striver teachers and the 10 educational assistants directly involved in the program.
3. Evaluation of curriculum and materials used in Project Striver.
4. Discussion with pupils regarding their participation in the program.
5. The collection and analysis of achievement data, the results of which are included in this report.

The design that constituted product measurement for Project Striver was as follows:

Area of Behavioral change	Degree of change	Reference
In reading skills grades 4,5,6.	the target population will demonstrate achievement beyond expectation ($p.<.05$)	as measured by the appropriate level of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT)

SAMPLING PLAN

The total treatment group was comprised of all students that has participated in Project Striver and had been tested on a pre/post basis. A 100% was utilized.

TEST SCHEDULE:

Pretest	October, 1978	SAT/Form B
Posttest	May, 1979	SAT/Form B

INSTRUMENTS:

Grade	Pretest	Postest
4	SAT-Primary III-Form B	Primary III-Form B
5	SAT-Intermediate I-Form B	Intermediate I-Form B
6	SAT-Intermediate II-Form B	Intermediate II-Form B

All subtests in the reading portion were administered on both the pretest and the posttest.

DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis of data was accomplished via the historical regression method. On the basis of scores drawn from the October, 1978 administration of the Standford Achievement Test (SAT) Form B, anticipated or predicted posttest scores were developed. These predicted posttest scores were then used for comparison with the actual posttest scores drawn from the May, 1979 administration of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) Form B. The null hypothesis to be tested was that there would be no significant difference between the predicted posttest scores and the actual posstest scores. By use of a t-test for correlated means, all test data were analyzed.

FINDINGS: OBSERVATIONS AND REVIEW OF PROGRAM RECORDS

A review of records indicated that 782 children participated in the program. Children in grades 4,5, and 6 were serviced at all 10 of the Title I elementary schools in the District. Selection procedures were effective in identifying those Title I eligible children who were marginal underachievers and were not eligible for participation in the Corrective Reading Program.

Staff utilization was as specified in the program proposal; (one) 1 Striver team consisting of a teacher and an Educational Assistant was assigned to each of the 10 program sites. All Striver teachers used a diagnostic/prescriptive model of teaching. A prescriptive plan to correct these learning deficits was developed by the teacher. To meet the wide range of needs presented by program participants, small group instruction was provided in increasing vocabulary acquistion through the use of structured exercises in structural analysis, and contextual analysis. Comprehension skills were developed on the literal, interpretive, and the evaluative levels via the use of the contained reader, tach-x, and accompanying software. All Striver labs had libraries with a wide selection of trade books. A library was established at most schools and program participants were encouraged to borrow books and read them for pleasure. Many of the books found in the Striver libraries were obtained through the Readings Is Fundamental Program (RIF) .

All Project Striver participants received instruction 4-5 times a week. The length of each instructional period was 45 minutes as specified in the proposal.

The average size of each instructional group was 9. The Project Striver teachers provided small group, and in some instances, individual instruction to program participants. The paraprofessional, under the direct supervision of the Striver teacher, provided appropriate reinforcement activities.

It should be noted that the evaluation team made three (3) rounds of classroom visits. All Striver personnel were observed working with children on the visitations made in November, March and May. As the 1978 school year progressed, Project Striver program staff demonstrated a continued pattern of professional competence that greatly enhanced and expanded the activities of the program.

During the individualized reading period, the Striver teacher held individual conferences with pupil participants to provide a student with assistance in a particular skill area, reviewed a student's progress or discussed a book that a child might be reading at the time. This format was highly successful; pupils were motivated and looked forward to the conferences.

One notable approach used by Project Striver teachers was relating reading to real life experiences. Each program site reflected the particular experiences, items of interest, and the environment of that particular school. This flexibility greatly enhanced the effectiveness of the program.

Teacher-made materials were excellent and were available from the inception of the program. However, a wide variety of commercial materials did not become available until February, 1979. The newly acquired commercial materials in conjunction with the teacher-made materials were most appropriate for skills development. Since teachers had many materials to choose from, it was possible to reinforce the same skill utilizing various approaches. The level of materials utilized paralled the interest level and maturity of the participants. Materials were suitable to the reading ability of the program participants.

A review of students' work folders indicated that planned sequence in skill development was a policy followed by the Striver staff. Skill lessons were based on an on-going diagnosis of deficiences. Specific skill teaching was observed inword recognition, comprehension, and study skills. The curriculum content of the Striver program stressed the acquisition of concepts that were essential to expanding the target population's critical reading skills both vertically and horizontally.

Based on direct observation of the programmatic activities at the 10 Project Striver sites and the conducting of interiviews with Project Striver personnel, tax-levy and RIMS resource teachers and on-site superivisory staff, it was clear to the evaluationteam that the Striver program had been implemented successfully.

Striver teachers, on the whole, maintained good to excellent levels of communication with their cooperating educational assistants and with their target population. Striver teachers did articulate with tax-levy teachers as well as RIMS resource teachers. A review of the Striver teachers' logs

indicated that regular conferencing with tax-levy teachers and RIMS resource personnel occurred on a regular basis.

Administrative and supervisory personnel expressed their enthusiasm about the Striver Program and hoped that this component would be recycled during the next school year (1979-80). The majority of personnel interviewed (RIMS resource teachers, principals, and assistant principals) felt that the Striver teachers were servicing a population often overlooked by Title I, the marginal unachievers.

ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS

Table 12 below summarizes the statistical analysis of the achievement data from Project Striver. As one can readily see the average growth from pre to posttest at grade 4 was 1 year and 4 months, at grade 5, 1 year and 9 months; and at grade 6, 2 years and 2 months. Growth of this magnitude is truly phemonenal. At each grade level, at posttest, children are reading at or above grade level. The program's primary objective of moving children to at least grade level performance has been realized. In all cases, the actual posttest scores were significantly greater than the scores which were predicted (based on pretest performance). These results were achieved with a program that operated for approximately 21-22 weeks. The children were serviced 4 times per week for 45 minutes per day.

TABLE 12
PRE & POSTTEST RESULTS OF THE S.A.T. - TOTAL SCORE
FOR PROJECT STRIVER

Grade	N	Pretest	Posttest	Growth	Predict. Posttest	t-Value Post vs. Pre Post	Signif.
4	261	3.49	4.85	+1.36	4.22	2.14	$<.05$
5	281	3.81	5.70	+1.89	4.42	3.05	$<.05$
6	211	4.83	7.01	+2.18	5.51	3.66	$<.05$

The performance of the children on each of the subtests of the SAT are presented in Table 13 below. A review of this table show that the most growth (i.e. from pre to posttest) occurs in the area of word study skills, followed by comprehension and then vocabulary. It should be noted that at each of grade levels 4,5, and 6 children, on the average, are at least at or above grade level in word study skills and comprehension at posttest. It maybe assumed that emphasis of the program in comprehension has had a definite positive effect.

TABLE 13
PRE & POSTTEST RESUTLS OF THE S.A.T.-SUBTESTS
FOR PROJECT STRIVER

Grade	Vocabulary		Comprehension		Word Study Skills	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
4	2.6	3.6	3.7	4.9	3.6	5.2
5	3.6	4.3	3.8	5.6	3.5	5.7
6	4.6	5.6	4.7	6.7	4.9	7.2

TEACHERS QUESTIONNARIE

As found in all funded programs the staff is highly experienced and well educated. Eighty-six (86%) percent of the teachers have attained masters degrees, with one at the Ph.D. level. Seven teachers responded to the survey, with an average tenure of thirteen years' teaching and one and a half years in Striver.

The selection process using the N.Y.C. Reading Testing seemed to satisfy participants, since only two suggested alternatives of teacher judgment.

Table 14 shows teachers' perception of various program components. Most frequently recommended instructional materials were Barnell Loft , contained reader and SRA. In all, fifteen different materials were identified.

The coordination of funded and tax levy programs was repeatedly mentioned as an area of concern. More formalization and higher frequency of conferences on individualized children was recommended. As found in Title I Corrective Reading, teachers requested that they and their tax-levy colleagues have opportunities to do cooperative programming even with elementary aspects of curriculum such as text and workbook selection. Open and flexible communication was strongly recommended. As was discussed in the previous section, there were many attempts, some very successful, at coordination.

In addition to the often-found request for more informal assessment procedures, some teachers commented that standardized "test-taking skills" were lacking in their population of students, thus placing them at an initial disadvantage in terms of assessment reliability/accuracy.

Several specific areas of additional training were cited: scope and sequence of skills, dealing with limits in space and materials; A-V; task organization for paraprofessionals.
illustrated by the

TABLE 14

FREQUENCY OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION: "HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM? BY PROJECT STRIVER TEACHERS

Aspects of the Program	Very Ineffective 1	2	Somewhat Effective 3	4	Very Effective 5
a. Amount of financial resources available	0	2	4	0	1
b. Ease of access to those funds	1	2	2	1	1
c. Variety of materials available	1	1	2	3	0
d. Amounts of materials available	1	1	5	0	0
e. The organization of staff	0	0	0	4	3
f. Staff spirit or morale	1	0	0	3	3
g. Quality of staff performance	0	0	1	2	3*missing response
h. Administration	0	0	0	4	3
i. Student interest	0	0	0	5	2
j. Student motivation	0	0	0	5	2
k. Student performance	0	0	2	3	2
l. Cooperation from other school personnel	0	0	2	2	2
m. Selection procedures for pupils in the	0	2	3	0	2
n. Physical Facilities	1	1	3	1	1
o. Time allotted for pupils receiving instruction	1	0	2	3	1
p. Number of pupils in each group	0	2	2	2	1
q. Coordination with tax levy program	0	2	2	1	2
r. Monthly Workshops	0	0	1	4	2
s. "pull-out" program	0	2	2	1	1*missing response
t. District office staff liaisons	0	0	0	3	4

These included: "more anything;" individualized books; paperback library; A-V equipment. Concerning space needs: "leaky roof" and lack of space found consistently. Observation indicated that there were adequate materials, after Feb. 1979. It is suggested that some informal discussion, at the beginning of the year, be planned with a committee of teachers.

Echoing previous data, more training was seen as important. Table 15 illustrates rankings of the various roles of the educational assistants. Although only seven teachers contributed data, the distribution of "priorities" seems much less clear-cut than that found in other programs. This is dramatized by the average rankings for working with individuals and with groups, 3.1 and 2.2 respectively.

TABLE 15
PROJECT STRIVER TEACHERS PRIORITIES OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS

a.	1 review	1	3	3	3	4	-
b.	2 drill	2	4	6	2	5	4
c.	6 present new material	-	0	7	-	2	-
d.	3 work with individual	4	1	1	4	6	3
e.	4 groups	5	2	2	1	1	1
f.	9 grading daily	6	5	4	6	8	2
g.	10 liaison	10	8	11	-	9	-
h.	5 planning activities	3	6	8	5	3	6
i.	7 clerical	7	7	5	7	7	5
j.	administeration	8	0	10	-	10	-
k.	8 correct	9	9	9	8	11	-

Teachers perceived program strengths in terms of individualization and excellent communication with coordinators. Weaknesses consisted of material and physical inadequacies; unclear role of paraprofessionals; need for more articulation between Striver and Title I regarding placement and student "involvement". Longer instructional blocks were advised, as was better screening, paraprofessional staff development and parent involvement.

Striver was perceived as a support system for student motivation, positive self-concept and student independence. Assessment and individualized conference opportunities were seen as critical to maintain such support.

EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS QUESTIONNNAIRE

Once again, the program has a highly experienced group of E.A.'s. The perceptions of the five educational assistants can be found in the frequency distribution in Table 15. Results are supportive of the program.

TABLE 15

FREQUENCIES FOR PROGRAM COMPONENTS - EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANTS

Aspect of the Program	Very Ineffective 1	2	Somewhat Effective 3	4	Very Effective 5
a. Variety of materials available	0	0	1	3	1
b. Sufficient amounts of materials available	0	0	3	1	1
c. The organization of staff	0	0	4	3	0
d. Staff spirit or morale.	0	0	1	3	1
e. Quality of staff performance	0	0	0	2	3
f. Administration	1	0	1	2	1
g. Student interest	0	1	2	1	2
h. Student motivation	0	0	2	1	2
i. Student performance	0	0	2	2	1
j. Cooperation from school administration	0	0	1	3	1
k. Selection procedures for pupils in the program	0	1	0	3	1
l. Phsycial facilities	0	0	0	2	3
m. Time allotted for pupils receiving instruction	0	0	2	2	1
n. Number of pupils in each group	1	0	3	0	1
o. Diagnostic evaluation	0	1	1	1	1
p. Coordination with tax-levy program	0	2	1	2	0
q. Monthly workshops/ para-teacher training session	0	1	1	2	1

Educational assistants shared teacher sentiments on major strenths and weaknesses. Table 16 indicates more consistency of perceptions regarding duties and responsibilities, although working with small groups is clearly the priority role.

PRINCIPALS QUESTIONNAIRE

The six administrators shared a number of the positive perceptions with regard to maximizing individualization, student motivation and independence.

Conference time for planning and evaluation and generally more effective communication strategies were recommended, as were reasonable screening criteria and more teacher judgment/imput in the selection process.

TABLE 16

RATINGS OF E.A.'s OF THEIR JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

a.	Review	3	1	3	3	3
b.	Drill specific skills	4	3	7	2	4
c.	New materials	5	5	8	4	0
d.	Work with individual st.	2	4	1	5	1
e.	Work with small group	1	2	2	1	2
f.	Grading daily work	6	7	6	6	5
g.	Acting as teacher-parent liaison	11	9	11	11	8
h.	Planning activities with teacher	7	6	5	7	6
i.	Clerical duties	8	8	4	10	7
j.	Admin. tests	9	11	10	8	0
k.	Correcting tests	10	10	9	9	9

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROJECT STRIVER.

Project Striver is a unique program of exceptional quality providing individualized and/or small group instruction in reading to Title I pupils in grades 4,5, and 6, who were marginal underachievers. Evidence of a high-level of administration and implementation support quantitative evidence of concrete or real effectiveness. Features of this program which can serve as models for replication in other Title I and tax-levy component are:

1. Administrative support at the local level, scheduling, articulated support, materials and freedom of implementation.
2. Careful record keeping and joint planning with tax-levy teachers and RIMS resource personnel.
3. A well planned training program, coordinated by the District Title I Reading Coordinator that placed great emphasis on assisting teachers in mastering the process of individualization.
4. The on-site support provided by the Coordinator of Title I Reading Programs to Striver teachers in preparing their daily prescriptions and their group prescriptions.
5. The Director of Funded Programs is to be commended for the quality of the program proposal. It is a indicator of District #6's commitment of providing quality education to all children in District 6 schools.

THE EVALUATION TEAM RECOMMENDS:

1. Full recycling of this program in the Title I umbrella for the 1979-80 school year.

The following recommendations are offered for consideration:

1. All materials should be available to Project Striver personnel in September so that an early "start up" be implemented successfully.
2. In-service training workshops for the 1979-80 school year should acquaint Striver teacher with the various informal tests that can be used to make a "quick" assessment of a child's weakness.
3. Articulation among Project Striver, tax-levy, and RIMS resource personnel must be maintained in order to insure the continued success of the program.

MATHEMATICS LABORATORY
(5043-91625)
MATH LAB
(IMPACT AID - 5043-98722)

THE PROGRAM: A DESCRIPTION

The Math Laboratory Program was designed to provide services to eligible Title I children in the Elementary schools and in the Junior High Schools who are one (1) or more years retarded in mathematics as measured by the N.Y. City Test (SAT) in Math-April 1978 (computation only) or the District #6 grade placement test (September 1978).

The program was designed to meet the individual needs of children who have experienced difficulty in mastering the essential computational skills in mathematics. The Program attempted to raise the computational skills of the underachieving students in mathematics.

The laboratory sessions focused on providing practice in mental and written computation, practice in verbal problem solving and improving basic arithmetic skills.

Small groups and individual students were exposed to multi-model, multi-sensory instruction in mathematics. Special Math Laboratory equipment was used to facilitate this personalized learning. Teachers supported the regular developmental math program by providing concentrated remedial instruction in math concepts and computation.

The laboratory sessions included manipulation with lab-materials, practice in mental and written computation and practice in verbal problem solving. Prescribed programs of corrective instruction were developed. All remedial groups were kept small to insure maximum teacher-pupil interaction. Abstractions were carefully introduced and the sequential developments planned whereby students move from the concrete to the semi-concrete and the semi-abstract to the abstract.

At the beginning of the program, every student was diagnosed as to specific skill deficiencies. An item analysis of the SAT pre-test provided the individual diagnosis. The results of the item analysis, combined with the suggested comments from the regular tax levy teacher, provided the necessary information for planning a learning schedule for the students.

A progress profile was maintained on each student in the Math Lab Program. The profile, provided a graphic analysis of each individual student's basic arithemtic strength and weaknesses. It served as the basis for work and instruction and as a guideline for teacher assisted instruction.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The evaluation of the MATH LAB program was comprehensive. The effort focused on both product and process evaluation. All classrooms were observed, interviews were conducted with children, teachers and educational assistants, and questionnaires were completed by Principals, teachers and educational assistants.

The design which constituted the product evaluation was as follows:

Behavioral Objectives

Pupils participating in the program will demonstrate a statistically significant gain when actual and projected posttest SAT scores are compared using the USOE Model A-1.

Evaluation Design

The purpose of this evaluation is to appraise student progress in math skills in the above-mentioned setting. The appropriate level of the Stanford Achievement Test was used on a pre/post test-basis.

Test Schedule:

Pre-test:	October, 1978	Form B
Post-Test:	May, 1979	Form B

Statistical Analysis

Data was analyzed using the USOE Model A-1.

The levels of the SAT-Math used at each grade level was as follows;

Grade	Pretest and Posttest
2	SAT- Primary I-Form B
3	SAT- Primary II-Form B
4	SAT- Primary III-Form B
5	SAT- Intermediate I-Form B
6	SAT- Intermediate II-Form B
7,8 & 9	SAT- Advanced -Form B

Note, this is basically on a level testing.

ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS

Table 16 below shows the results of the pre and posttesting of children who participated in the Title I Mathematics Laboratory. Pre to posttest growth ranges from 6 months in grade 8 to 1 year and 4 months at grades 4 and 5. The magnitude of this growth is quite meaningful, in light of the fact that the children are anywhere from 1.7 to 5.1 years behind in their math achievement. The program, particulary at the elementary grades, has served to narrow the gap between achievement and grade level placement.

As with the analysis of previous program data, a t-test was performed between the actual posttest score and what would have been expected based on one's history of previous achievement. The results of this analysis indicates significant differences between actual and predicted posttest for grades 3-6, but not for grades 7-9. These findings were not what would have been anticipated based on formal observation of the programs and previous years results. For all intensive purposes, the elementary school program and JHS program are similar; thus, what could cause these disparate results? The explanation, we believe, is to be found in the concept of heterogeneity of groupings. Simply stated, the more alike a group is, the easier it is to teach, and the corollary. the more disparate the population, the harder it is to communicate (i.e. teach) information. A statistical measure of homogeneity or heterogeneity is the standard deviation (S.D.) or the average discrepancy each test score has from the average performance. A review of our pretest data show the following,

Grade	2	S.D. - .73
	3	S.D. - .79
	4	S.D. - .90
	5	S.D. - .97
	6	S.D. - 1.06
	7	S.D. - 4.18
	8	S.D. - 2.72
	9	S.D. - 3.39

One can readily see that at grades 3,4,5 and 6 the standard deviation fluctuates between about 8 months and 1 year; whereas, at grade 7 the S.D. is over 4 years, at grade 8 2.7 years and at grade 9, 3.4 years. There thus seems to be apparent differences in the groups each of the organizational levels must deal with. Consequently, it appears that a key ingredient to the success of the math program is the homogeneity of the group at the start of the program. Based on these data, and a review of other program data, the "magic number" would appear to be one year; that is, the groups teacher deals with should not fluctuate by more than one year from the average of the class. These findings may necessitate a review of the organizational practices of the JHS. Although the program is generally paralleled with the reading program, it may be necessary to rethink the group practices. These data, particularly at the elementary level and at one JHS, do show that the more homogeneous the group, the greater the actual growth and significant differences of posttest from predicted posttest.

A review of Table 17 show the performance of all grade levles for each of the subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test -Math.

TABLE 16

PRE & POSTTEST RESULTS OF THE SAT - TOTAL SCORE
FOR THE TITEL I MATHEMATICS PROGRAM

Grade	N	Pretest	Posttest	Growth	Predicted Posttest	t-Value Post vs. Pred. Post	Signif.
2	237	1.03	1.97	+ .94	1.1	2.25	.05
3	363	1.51	2.76	+1.25	1.72	2.89	.05
4	330	2.54	3.96	+1.42	2.99	2.77	.05
5	256	3.21	4.64	+1.43	3.70	2.41	.05
6	279	4.38	5.68	+1.30	4.93	2.03	.05
7	299	3.37	4.32	+ .95	3.72	.87	NS
8	254	3.35	3.94	+ .59	3.64	.48	NS
9	272	4.14	4.97	+ .83	4.49	.70	NS

TABLE 17

MATH PRE AND POSTTEST RESULTS OF THE S.A.T.-SUBTESTS FOR THE MATH LABS

Grade	Concept		Comprehension		Application	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
2	K.8	2.3 +1.5	1.3	2.4 +1.0	K.3	K.1 - .2
3	1.5	2.9 +1.4	1.7	3.0 +1.3	1.5	2.5 +1.0
4	2.6	4.0 +1.4	2.7	4.5 +1.8	2.5	3.4 + .9
5	3.3	4.6 +1.3	3.6	5.1 +1.5	3.2	4.2 +1.0
6	4.1	5.5 +1.4	4.4	5.9 +1.5	3.9	4.9 +1.0
7	3.5	4.4. + .9	4.6	6.6 +2.0	3.1	4.3 +1.2
8	3.6	4.1 + .5	5.5	6.5 +1.0	3.2	3.7 + .5
9	6.1	7.1 +1.0	6.3	7.4 +1.1	1.9	2.4 + .5

The Table presents pre andposttests-testing dates were October and May respectively. In reviewing this for some indications of where the instructional program may be strengthened, it is important to remember that the children are still performing below grade level expectations. However, the area that seems to have shown the most growth is computation, followed by math concepts. Remember, the teaching of computation skills was the primary objective of the program. Applications of math principles seems to have caused the most difficulty; particularly at the JHS level. Note that growth at grades 8 and 9 is very small and that grade level performance is over 4 years at grade 8 and 7 years at grade 9 below what one would expect. It is recommended that the area of math applications be strengthened if this objective is a viable one.

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Of the twenty-two respondents, almost ninety percent (90%) had taught for ten or more years, while forty percent (40%) had classroom experience of over fifteen years. A firm majority of the teachers had masters level degrees. The math lab teachers were generally well experienced.

According to logistical data for the program, guideline criteria for frequency of contact with students and group size were met. Most teachers also reported additional duties to Title I responsibilities. Selection procedures most often reflected a combination of screening test and teacher judgement. Suggested alternatives for screening included teacher-made tests and disregarding the District #6 Grade Placement Test (something which cannot be done). Among the most popularly rated teaching materials were DICOM, SRA, UNIFIX, and teacher-made materials. A number of games and manipulatives were also listed. Finally, target population, attrition for math was slightly less on the average than for other funded programs reporting on the survey.

Tax-levy coordination on both formal and informal bases was noted. A goal of weekly scheduled meetings was frequently cited. Over thirty-five (35%) of the teachers indicated that they shared with tax levy colleagues a written form with detailed monthly or weekly lab information in Math Lab. While some teachers indicated satisfaction with the present system, over half recommended regularly scheduled meetings to coordinate lessons.

Teacher perceptions of various program components contained highly positive ratings with the possible exceptions of "ease of access to funds" and "selection procedures for pupils."

Related to selection procedures is a spectrum of negative comments about pre-post testing in general. Alternatives suggested by staff were (1) staggering math and reading tests to minimize student "overload", (2) clarification of analysi sheets, (3) criterion reference tests matched to district curriculum goals, (4) tax levy and Title I planning/discussion of test implications for students.

When asked for ideas concerning next year's training, teachers listed a range of specific topics ranging from metrics to working with L.D. children. Several also mentioned the value of simply having formal "exchange of ideas"

sessions between labs (please see recommendations section of report.)

Concerns and problems were sparse. Almost half reported "none" and a few cited "space" constrictions, and "too much paperwork." Well over half the teachers indicated no need for improvements, while several did note concern with receiving program materials earlier in the school year. The only relatively substantial response to a domain for concern was testing. This reinforces findings throughout with regard to selection, screening, and pre-post tests as being inadequately implemented.

When teachers were requested to rank order the duties they saw the educational assistant performing, the functions receiving the highest prority was working with individuals and small groups.

PRINCIPALS QUESTIONNAIRE

Twelve administrators filled out surveys. In delimiting strengths there was consensus that the pupil-staff ratios did maximize small group instruction. Many principals underscored the individualized nature of the program, backed up by such components as prescriptive lab approaches to individual student needs. Material abundance and diversity was also perceived as supportive of program objectives.

Professional and paraprofessional program staff were highly praised, and lab teachers were cited as resources for the entire school. In like manner, the district coordinator was singled out for his help and effectiveness in administering the district program.

Weak areas also elicited a fairly general sense of agreement in the areas of screening and coordination betweeen funded and tax-levy teachers. Recommendations were broad: better communication for entire staff; flexibility in assigning or deleting pupils from the program at the local school level. Scant negative reactions to the "pull-out" concept were found. Several recommended more paraprofessionals, more computers, and more eligible students. In addition to these areas of consensus individuals suggested SAT's early in September, second year "unofficial" options for pupils in program, more coordination between math and reading.

OBSERVATION OF THE PROGRAM

The continuation of observations from the time of our interim report has reaffirmed initial perceptions that the Title I math program is highly successful. Ranging from prescription learning systems for individuals to well managed small group programs. Becuase many of my spring observations coincided with District Math Fair activities, opportunities were ripe to see a variety of uniques instructional devices and plans. At PS 192 an excellent example of pragmatic and conceptual mixtures was found. Math lab teachers used home design and architecture as the domain for a variety of skills in computation and abstraction. Their curriculum was leveled according to "group" needs. Children had opportunities for concrete translation of their plans into scale models for their "dream house," (see attached) and these models were displayed for others. Student motivation and enthusiasm was an

important element here.

Math assessment and information management has also come a long way in all schools from last year. In addition to ready-structured programs like DICOM, teachers were using their own criterion-reference systems (for example, at PS 115, 128, 192, 132 JHS 52). Not all teachers were truly able to utilize criterion reference or diagnostic data in instructional planning, however, which reveals a still critical need for moving from rigid mastery/non-mastery perspectives to more fluid prescriptive perspectives.

Prescriptive Learning (PL) is a good facilitator of organization and management, but still needs a constant teacher sensistivity to student fluctuations in motivation and interest. Teachers did seeem to adapt from vendor's suggested system to meet class needs. PL pretest information and SAT information may require some judicious coordination in terms of relative value for screening or student placement.

The variety of materials was, as last year, rich. More frequent use of manipulatives, games, and specialized programs (like DLM) was observed. Also more " indirect sharing" with tax levy teachers also seemed to provide a positive linkage. Individualized skill packets were also in evidence, though with the exception of PL, small group instruction still predominated.

In general SAT item analysis data was not utilized by teachers to screen or to validate previous placement decisions. The timing of the test and test results seems to be a real obstacle to incorporation of that information into any formative planning process.

Inservice sessions were, in general, praised. District coordination was likewise supported whole-heartedly. Recommendations center primarily on communication between tax levy and funded program, however, it must be noted that Title I math does demonstrate more success and more diversity of techniques in that direction than any other program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) It is recommended that the program be recycled for the academic year 1979-80.

2) Although the observation of the JHS program showed many valuable areas being adequately covered, the program did not produce the results anticipated. We believe the reason for this is that the groups are just too diverse in skills attainment to service adequately. It is recommended that rather than drawing children across a grade level to each lab, that children be assigned to a lab on the basis of the score on the screening test and teacher recommendation. Although this may creat initial organizational problems, the children should benefit in the long haul.

3) There is so much of value happening in each individual school that the time expended on visitations during school hours, across programs, would be of tremendous value. Understanding that all funded program staffs are well qualified and represent centuries of experience with children; nevertheless, individuals and school teams do develop valuable blends of instruction which are worth observing. I would strongly qualify this recommendation with the provision that any representative of a school funded program who visits another district school program has the obligation to share observations and information with all funded teachers (and appropriate tax levy teachers as well). Even across subject areas, many valuable examples can be found of individualization, record keeping and management, teacher-made assessment systems, teacher made materials, phsycial arangements of rooms, etc.

4) Coordination between tax levy teachers and funded teachers has been brought up as a concern for two years in all programs. In addition, coordination and more flexible communication between funded programs has also been suggested this year (especially since target kids may overlap programs). Specific strategies have proven effective in some schools. These include written progress/track sheets kept by Title I teachers for individual students (preferable) and for whole class groups (better than nothing). These sheets are shared with tax levy classroom teachers. The flaw here is that tax levy teachers must also contribute actively to such a communication process. Simple teacher made formats can be developed cooperatively by funded and tax levy teachers, upon agreement of fundamental data necessary.

5) This recommendation is an important parallel to #4 above. Organizational structures must be initiated by admimistrators to free up teachers to plan cooperatively-- including their progress reporting. Informal meetings in hallways will never be replaced -- nor should they -- but all teachers need systematic and consistent opportunities to share. I would recommend at least three formal sharing meetings per year with representative tax-levy teachers and funded teachers. This group could consider itself a task force. Its responsibilities would not be to distribute or discuss data for individual children, but rather to set parameters which facilitate that goal. Suggestions from teachers included coordination of certain topic/unit areas to provide for skill building within common school (department/subject area) contexts. This is a reasonable goal since it does not require control of daily lesson planning -- only continuity in long range goal-setting. Also reasonable would be "task force" consensus ways to facilitate: homework; reporting progress; sharing new materials, etc. More general sharing takes place at Math Fairs, etc. and I would also recommend that schools be encouraged to illustrate their processes of communication as much as their wares.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
(5043-91626)

THE PROGRAM: A DESCRIPTION

School District #6 has many recent arrivals from Hispanic countries who have little or no knowledge of the English language. This lack of English language skills prevents them from functioning normally in academic subjects in schools. An intensive program of instruction in E.S.L. which includes the development of oral-aural ability and the development of basic reading skills is essential in assisting them in overcoming this language handicap. Consequently, the purpose of the Title I E.S.L. Program was to aid in the development of sufficient English language fluency so as to enable the students to move rapidly into the main stream of the normal school program.

The E.S.L. program enriched and intensified instruction in English by utilizing the oral-aural approach for all children in need of English as a second language.

This program was designed to improve the students' ability to understand and speak English by providing an intensive, sequential, small group instructional program in English as a second language.

Pupils were selected on the basis of performance on the New York City Language Assessment (LAB) test. Pupils with the lowest scores were given priority. Services were provided from grades 3-6 in the Elementary Schools, grades 7-9 in the Junior High School.

Working with the student's limited knowledge of the spoken English language, and in some cases no knowledge at all, the program took into account that the participants must learn to speak before they can read and that the reading range of the pupils will be limited by their speaking ability.

The program concentrated on intensive sequential small group instructional program utilizing the oral-aural approach using such materials as puppets, pictures, games, filmstrips, etc. Activities also included dialogues, dramatics, mime-all designated to encourage children to use English as a second language. The program developed facility in the use of English language to the point where children could particpate in a reading program (in English).

The program was designed to service 90 children in ten (10) elementary schools and 100 children in each JHS. The Title I E.S.L. team consisted of one (1) teacher of English as a Second Language and two (2) Educational Assistants in each school. There were 28 instructional periods in the Elementary schools and 23 periods in JHS. The children were scheduled for ESL instruction 3-5 times per week. In round figures, there were 1200 children in the program, 13 teachers, 26 Educational Assistants, and 1 teacher-coordinator.

EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation of this component of the Title I Umbrella was similar to the other components. There was both a product and process evaluation of the program. The process evaluation encompassed systematic observations of each schools' program, interviews of teachers and paras, and questionnaires completed by teachers, Educational Assistants and principals.

The product evaluation is stated as follows,

Behavioral Objective
Pupils will significantly gain in percentile score as a result of participation in the program (LAB Test)

Evaluation Design
The purpose of this evaluation is to appraise students progress in English. Pre-/post-test measures will be derived from the New York City Language Assessment Battery.

Test Schedule
Pre-test: October, 1978
Post-test: April, 1979

Statistical Analysis
Data will be analyzed using the USOE Model A-1.

EVALUATION FINDINGS: LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT

Table 18 below summarizes the results of the analysis of the pre and posttesting with the Language Assessment Battery-English. All data are presented in terms of the number of items answered correctly (i.e. raw score). Raw score was used because of the nature of the norming process of the LAB-English. At the lower end of the raw score scale, the conversion to percentile rank is restrictive. An increase of one percentile rank (i.e. 1 to 2) may encompass as many as 20 raw score points. Thus, it was believed that a more accurate reflective of growth in the expressive and receptive aspects of language was the actual improvement in terms of the number of items answered correctly, from the pretesting to the posttesting. The total raw score used in these analyses is composed of 4 subtests-reading, writing, listening comprehension and speaking.

TABLE 18

PRE & POSTTEST LANGUAGE ASSESSMENT BATTERY (TOTAL RAW SCORE) RESULTS

Grade	Pretest		Posttest		t-value	Signif.
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.		
3	20.07	13.56	38.53	15.95	12.14	.001
4	25.81	19.16	44.73	21.42	10.94	.001
5	27.20	22.75	47.82	21.32	11.52	.001
6	24.77	20.98	49.48	18.46	13.73	.001
7	12.55	16.40	32.93	12.57	12.58	.001
8	15.13	14.51	35.34	11.10	13.75	.001
9	5.27	6.91	35.97	8.53	18.72	.001

Briefly, the results indicate that the ESL component provide an instructional program that allows children to significantly improve their performance from pre to posttesting. This is true for all grade levels (3-9). In reviewing these data it is interesting to qote the wide diversity of students the ESL teacher has to educate. This diversity is shown by the large standard deviations; in general, it is about three-quarters or more of the average score. However, in spite of this the ESL teachers were able to provide a program which met the individual needs of the students.

The ESL component was functional for approximately 23 weeks. At the elementary level the program was 4 days per week and the JHS level, 3.5 days per week. Further, at the elementary level the child was serviced 45 minutes per day and at the JHS 40 minutes per day. The above, thus defines the paramenters of instruction by which the above results were achieved.

Although the above results in terms of raw score are quite encouraging, it is important to put them in some more meaningful perspective in terms of the norming group. The norming group for the LAB-English was a stratified random sample of monolingual English students in N.Y.C. Thus, the comparison of the District 6 ESL-Spanish dominant students was against an English-speaking population. The ocnversion of the R.S. to percentile rank still puts the child below the 10th percentile. That is, when the child who is participating in the ESL component is compared to an English speaking population he still performs at the lowest 10th percentile. The average score is exceeded by about 90% or more of the monolingual English norming group. So that although the child made significant progress in terms of improvement of the number of items answered correctly, these children are still performing poorly relative to the norm group. These results are nonetheless still very impressive and encouraging to a superior ESL component.

TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

Educational and experiential characteristics of ESL teachers (nine answered survey) are essentially the mirror image of those for all funded programs. T.e most immediate distinction picked up by the questionnaire was in the procedures for selection fo students. Only one third of the respondents had "confidence" in LAB scores. Over 60% depended on referral and subjective judgment criteria in addition to LAB data. These procedures do not necessarily constitute spurious methods for selection; that they do, however, emphasize the negativity and lack of confidence in LAB. The response regarding alternative selection procedures was scattered, not specific. (The exception was the suggestion for diagnostic tests in native language and more refined distinction between oral and reading tests.)

ESL teachers seem aware of their need for other selection options, but unable to determine what form these might take in any consistent way. This finding was reinforced by our observations and interviews in most ESL classrooms. Teachers are not usually trained in assessment (formal or informal) as relates to the language acquisition needs of children.

The ESL teacher's ratings of distinct program components share a pattern of general support as was found for all Title I programs.

A-V and illustrative charts/pictures were rated highly as instructional materials. At least half the teachers stated they create their own materials.

Regarding communication with tax-levy teachers, all state that this is an area of concern, and needs administrative support. Principals also rank this as a number one priority for the coming year. The most frequently cited mode of instruction was "small group". ESL teachers perceived space as a constriction to program implementation.

ESL teachers, in consonance with the other Title I programs saw the para as most valuable in providing instruction to individuals and small groups.

The major strenths and weaknesses of the program as seey the principal and teachers are summarized below;

STRENGTHS
team approach
flexibility according to children's needs

WEAKNESSES
attrition
paperwork
no permanent room
not enough time between classes to pick up and return kids
LAB test

CONCERNS
test data unable to reflect progress in first year.
ESL teachers should not be used as subs
less clericalwork
allow for turnover and new arrivals
no way to diagnose and deal with children who are not achieving due to a learning disability or emotional problem
bilingual tax levy teachers should teach in English at least part of the time
better interaction between teachers and better training of personnel was very highly rated

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The ESL component of the Title I Umbrella is an integral part of the Districts' plan to integrate the predominantly language-handicapped population of the district into the mainstream of English language instruction. Based on observation(s) of the program, interview and questionnaire data and analysis of achievement data, the program seems to have been effective in promoting English language competency.

It is recommended, however, that the followings suggestions be considered to improve the program;

1. Improvement of the communication process of Title I ESL teachers and tax-levy teachers. This is very important, since most of the child's day is spent in the tax-levy classroom. One suggestion to enhance communication is for the Title I ESL teacher to conduct workshops for tax levy teachers utilizing specific methodolgy and materials which are applicable to the classroom situation.

2. A committe be established to investigate and recommend specific changes in the procedures to be used in the selection of children to the program. The committee should be established by December 1979 and a final report issued no later than May 1980.

3. Due to the large mobility rate in the District and resultant loss of population, it is suggested that a greater number of children be targeted for the program.

PROJECT SUCCESS
(5043-91627)

THE PROGRAM: DESCRIPTION

Project Success recognizes that a small percentage of the school population is functioning in reading and/or mathematics three or more years below grade level. Because of poor academic performance, students often develop problems in social/personal adjustment. Severe educational retardation often results in emotional difficulties which interact with problems related to academic performance. It was believed possible to diagnose a student with severe learning problems and to prescribe a highly-individualized and appropriate remedial program which would result in significanctly-increased achievement. To allow for optimum success, it was essential that each student experiencing severe educational retardation be identified as early as posssible, and that a program of remediation be implemented. To meet these needs a program of intensive diagnostic and prescriptive services in reading and mathematics was designed. The program-Project Success- had both an instructional and a guidance component. The program serviced 60 program participants in grades 4 through 7 with intensive remedial and guidance support. Only students whose home school was in District 6 were eligible for program participation. Students from the Districts' 11 elementary schools were eligible to be considered for program inclusion.

The site selected for the program's operation during the 1978-79 school year was I.S./J.H.S. 164-the Edward W. Stitt Intermediate School. Project Success, although physically situated at I.S./J.H.S. 164, was not part of the schools' organization. The staff assigned to Project Success included 1 Program Coordinator, a guidance counselor, two tax levy classroom teachers, one Title I Reading teacher, and one Title I mathematics teacher. Two educational assistants were also assigned to the program. The on-site supervision of the program was the responsibility of the Program Coordinator, while at the district level the program responsibility was assigned to the Director of Funded Programs.

All program participants were selected on the basis of the referral of the principal of their home school. The selection process included referrals being forwarded to the District 6 Supervisor of Guidance. A thorough review of all data relevant to the pupil being referred was conducted. If it was felt a student would benefit from participation in Project Success, a thorough explanation of the program was given to the students and to the parent. Only with parental consent could a student participate in the program.

EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

The evaluation design for Project Success specified both process and product evaluation. Formal evaluation of Project Success began in November, 1978. The evaluative effort was to focus on the degree to which the program objectives had been implemented. Process evaluation procedures included three rounds of visits to the project site.

Methods employed by the evaluation team in conducting the study of this component were as follows:

1. Direct observation of the instructional activities of the program.
2. Interviews were conducted with the Director of Funded Programs, the Coordinator of Project Success, the Title I program staff assigned to this component, and the tax-levy teachers.
3. Evaluation of curriculum and materials used in the Project Success program.
4. Discussions with pupils regarding their participation in the program.
5. The collection and analysis of achievement data in reading and mathematics, the results of which are included in this report.

The design that constituted product evaluation for Project Success was as follows:

Area of	Degree of change	Reference
Behavioral change in reading skills and in mathematics skills.	50% of the pupils participating in the program will show a statistically significant gain in reading and mathematical achievement	as measured by the appropriate level of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) in reading and mathematics

SAMPLING PLAN

The total treatment group was comprised of all students that had participated in Project Success and had been tested on a pre/post basis. A 100% sample was selected.

TEST SCHEDULE:

Pretest:	October, 1978	SAT/Form B
Posttest:	May, 1979	SAT/Form B

INSTRUMENTS: READING

Grade	Pretest	Posttest
4	Primary III-Form B	Primary III-Form B
5	Intermediate I-Form B	Intermediate I-Form B
6	Intermediate II-Form B	Intermediate II-Form B
7	Advanced-Form B	Advanced-From B
8	Advanced-Form B	Advanced-Form B

All sub-tests in the mathematics portion of the SAT were administered on both the pretest and the posttest.

DATA ANALYSIS

Data were analyzed via the historical regression model. On the basis of scores drawn from the October, 1978 administration of the Stanford Achievement

Test (SAT), Form B, anticipated or predicted posttest scores were then used for a comparison with the actual posttest scores derived from the May, 1979 administration of the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT) Form B.

Predicted posttest scores were compared with the actual posttest scores. The data use analyized by the use of a t-test for correlated means. To compensate for the severe educational retardation of the program participant extended out-of-level scaled scores were utilized. This procedure provided a far more realistic evaluation of pupils performance since it allowed for meaningful analysis and interpretation of reading and mathematics achievement data for a most atypical population. Results of pupil performance can be found below.

EVALUATION FINDINGS: ACHIEVEMENT TESTING

A total of 84 pupils participated in the reading component of Project Success and a total of 84 pupils participated in the mathematics component. In many cases, this was a duplicated count since pupils were in need of both services.

Reading Component

The results presented in Table 19 summarize the performance of students who participated in the reading component of Project Success. The table presents data for the Stanford Achievement Test-Reading for each grade level by subtests. Tests of statistical significance were performed using total G.E. score. A t-test between predicted posttest performance and actual posttest showed no statistical significance. A correlated t-test between pre and posttest also showed no significance. The reason for lack of statistical significance relates to the size of the sample used. The largest N was at grades 5 and 6, and at these levels they were both under 30-the recommended smaple size needed to produce reliable resuts.

TABLE 19
PRE & POSTTEST RESULTS FOR THE SAT - READING
BY SUBTEST

		Vocabulary		Comprehension		Word Study Skill		Total	
Grade	N	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
3	3	2.5	2.6	2.3	2.7	2.1	2.6	2.2	2.8
4	10	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.7	2.9
5	26	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.9	2.5	3.1	3.1	3.6
6	26	4.4	5.3	3.9	4.5	3.5	4.5	3.7	4.5
7	11	4.1	4.5	4.4	5.0	-	-	4.0	4.6
8	6	6.2	6.7	5.5	5.7	-	-	5.6	5.9

From an educational perspective, in an attempt to ascertain some knowledge of this alternative educational program, it may prove more advantageous to examine pre and posttest results by subtest. In all cases but one there seems to have been an increase in G.E. score from pre to posttest. The improvement seems to be, on the average, 4-6 months. These results are very encouraging in light of the fact that the children only participated in the program about 11.5 weeks and received approximately 70 hours of actual contact time in reading instruction (although there seems to be great variablility in this figure).

It seems, then, that the Project Success alternative program does have a positive impact in the improvement of reading. Remember, the children who participated in the program were discipline as well as learning problems in their schools. Attendance at an alternative site seems to have made impact on the childrens' ability to function a little better academically. The children are still functioning below grade level expectations, but no longer are they three or more years below grade level. The program has provided them an opportunity to "grow" at a greater rate than they did before. In previous years the children basically had a negatively-decelerating growth line; for each year in school they seemed to be moving further away from grade level expectations. Project Success may have begun the process of reversing this trend in reading.

Math Component

The achievement results of the mathematics component of Project Success are presented in Table 20. The same cautions in interpreting these data as the reading component are indicated. The table presents data for each grade level by subtests and total - G.E. scores are used.

The results, in general, indicate great variablity for each of the grade levels, as well as subtests. As a result of this variablity and sample size, one would have difficulties in drawing any educational inferences about the math component. It would seem that in reviewing this component greater emphasis should be placed on the observation discussed below.

TABLE 20
PRE & POSTTEST RESULTS OF THE SAT - MATH
BY SUBTEST

		Concepts		Computation		Application		Total	
Grade	N	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
3	3	3.9	4.4	2.9	4.0	4.3	4.3	3.7	4.1
4	11	3.7	3.4	4.0	3.7	2.6	2.3	3.4	3.2
5	25	3.6	3.5	4.0	3.9	2.9	2.4	3.3	3.2
6	27	4.1	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.8	3.7
7	12	5.1	5.3	4.9	4.7	4.6	3.5	4.6	4.4
8	6	5.3	6.1	5.5	6.1	5.2	5.6	5.3	6.2

OBSERVATIONS OF THE PROGRAM

The Reading Lab

A harmonious and highly professional working relationship had developed between the teacher and the educational assistant in which the teaching responsibilities were shared. They worked together very effectively; for example,the teacher pinpoints specific skill needs of certain students and the E.A. works with the samll group to reinforce those skills. Regular conferences are held in which progress is reviewed and new skill areas are planned.

The overall instructional climate provided in the Reading Lab encourages the students toward the serious pursuit of developing reading skills. During the observations, the students appeared to be highly motivated and to concentrate on their tasks. As they have been urged, the students come up to the teacher and E.A. regularly during the period to request meanings of words they are not familiar with. This procedure seems to increase motivation, both because of additional attention focused on the student and because the student can remain engrossed in the material.

Many students perceive that they are improving in reading (according to the Pupil Interview Form). They come to this conclusion either because they know their reading scores have improved (many have in fact increased substantially) and/or because they have been told they are improving by the teacher.

The Title I teacher and E.A. have developed reading skills assessment sheets that itemize entry and exit level skills. They are used as individual prescriptiv plans.

The teacher has brought into the Reading Lab many books from her home that she uses to motivate students by trying to increase their enjoyment of reading. She has instituted a "free reading" period for students to peruse these books.

The limitations of the Reading Lab are mainly functional. The Reading Lab shares one room withthe Math Lab; therefore, the space is very cramped and often noisy. Much instructional time is lost by the long trek (after pulling out students from the tax-levy class) up to an out-of-the-way corner near the top floor of the building. This is a very inefficient arrangement.

Also, since the theft of the A-V equipment in March, 1979 ther has been no replacement of material. Apparently the theft was due to a lock that needs to be installed. This process should be delayed no further.

Specific Recommendations:

1. The Reading Lab should be moved to a more accessible place, and its quarters should be expanded to a room by itself.
2. Since the students are usually 2-3 grades behind in reading, it is recommended that they stay in the program for <u>one year</u> in order to fully realize the necessary reading skills.

3. Even more "free reading" periods are recommended as a way to increase students' pleasure in reading and, therefore, their motivation to learn.

4. Order more high/interest-low/reading level books on the 3rd/4th grade reading level.

5. Concentrate further on creative writing as a means for students to become involved in reading.

The Math Lab

The strengths of the Math Lab lie in its diversity of available equipment (Dicom machines, Uniflex Cubes, etx.) and its low ratio of students to teacher and educational assistant. The low ratio can allow for more individual attention for each student. Also, many students (according to the Pupil Interview Form) perceive they are improving in Math.

The limitations involve the organizational problems. Up until about April students were doing whole lessons when they really needed attention only in specific skills. This has been corrected at the suggestion of one of the Math Coordinators. Comprehensive record-keeping procedures must be instituted to keep track of these individual skills. It is not sufficient to merely write them on the back of the students' workbooks. Also, the students' folders should be alphabetized in order to be accessible quickly when the students enter the Lab.

The teacher must use his educational assistant more effectively (perhaps working with a group of students on specific skills) so that he can divide his attention more evenly among his students.

Specific Recommendations:

1. Record-keeping procedures to keep track of skill lessons prescribed and mastered.
2. Alphabetize student folders
3. Make more efficient use of educational assistant
4. Allow student to answer questions posed

Counseling

The Guidance Counselor is especially effective in the area of record-keeping. A perusal of his counseling logs (with the persons contacted, action taken and summary of interview) gives an excellent overview of the counseling process of an individual student. He is responsible--for he can be counted on the follow-up on a request/referral made by given teacher.

Observation of Project Success indicates that for the program to be truly effective, the counseling process must be dynamic. One must take the initiative and go into the classroom and conduct guidance sessions or group counseling classes.

Specific Recommendations:

1. Have more guidance material available both for guidance sessions in the classroom and informal perusal in the guidance office.
2. Run group counseling or group guidance sessions either in the classroom or in another room secured for that purpose.
3. Change the intake interview procedure to include: first, an interview with the parent alone, then an interview with the student alone, and finally a joint interview with both of them together. This procedure can sometimes yield valuable and conflicting information that can be used to further the counseling process. This also redresses the problem with the present interview where the sole focus seems to be on the parent.
4. In the area of staff development, it is suggested that the counselor seek out and attend various counselling workshops (at APGA conference or through guidance personnel at the district office) where additional training in different counseling techniques may be offered.

Student Interview

Using an open-ended Pupil Interview Form may of the program participants were interviewed concerning the program. Below is the summary of their responses.

Overall, many of the students felt they were improving in Reading and Math. They concluded this from both improved test scores and positive feedback from their teachers.

A number of students, especially the older and brighter ones, felt that they were not getting enough class work to really engage them. They wanted more Social Studies, more Math, and so on. This indicates that there should be more group/individualized instruction where enrichment is provided for these students.

In addition, many requested that they be allowed to go outside at lunchtime. This seems to be a special hardship on these students.

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL READING PROGRAM
(5043-91628)

THE PROGRAM: A DESCRIPTION

An intensive reading program operated in the following Schools in grades 1-8: Our Lady of Lourdes, 468 West 143rd Street, St. Rose of Lima, 517 West 164th St., Incarnation, 570 W. 175th St., St. Elizabeth's, 612 W. 187 St.

The program was designed to reinforce the school's on-going reading program by providing corrective and remedial techniques to target eligible Title I children who were one or more years below grade level. Participants were selected from the list of eligible students compiled by the Central Board of Education, based on the standards they set for the '78-'79 school year.

The general objectives of the program were to provided: 1) Small group (5-10 students) and individualized instruction, 2) Remediation for deprived children who have basic skills deficiencies in reading, 3) Increased exposure to the school library as an incentive to encourage reading growth, 4) Increased exposure to audio-visual material will be provided in order to develop the child's perceptual intake. Another basic thrust of the lab program was that of "self-selection". The language lab offered the opportunity for the student to select his own reading material.

This program utilized a diagnostic prescriptive approach to meet the individual needs of identified students. Small group and individual instruction was provided by the reading team (Reading Teacher and Educational Assistants.) The pupils were involved in a variety of multi-media, multi-sensory activities in as many learning centers as possible, such as the school library and multi-media center. Each child had a diagnostic write-up whereby the teacher and aide were able to plot the individual's growth as he progressed from level to level.

The students in the program were scheduled to attend 45-minute sessions for a minimum of 2 sessions per week. A total of 180 students were to be serviced in this program by a team of one teacher and one paraprofessional for a total of 5 educational assistants. Listed below is a chart of how the number of students were to be serviced at each school.

School	Teacher	Ed. Assist.	No. of Participants
Our Lady of Lourdes	.2	1	30
St. Rose of Lima	.4	3	75
Incarnation	.2	1	30
St. Elizabeth	.2		30
			165

One part-time Assistant Coordinator, based at the District 6 Office, was necessary in order to facilitate communication between public and non-public school programs. She was the liaison between the non-public schools and the Title I Coordinator in District 6. She helped in the articulation of Title I services with the non-public schools services and activities. She visited Title I non-public schools for the purpose of helping to interpret, clarify, and implement Title I programs. The Assistant Coordinator in conjunction with the Title I Director coordinated all aspects of the non-public school program.

EVALUATION DESIGN

Behavioral Objective

Pupils participating in the program will significantly gain in achievement as compared to growth projected using the USOE Model A-1.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation is designed to assess student progress in reading skills in the above-mentioned setting. The appropiate level of the SAT was used on a pre/post test basis.

Test Schedule

Pre-test:	October 1978-Form B
Post-test:	April 1979-Form B

Statistical Analysis

Data for both pre-and post-tests will be presented in terms of Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE) and analyzed using USOE - Model A-1.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

Tables 21 & 22 present both pre and posttest results for the SAT-Reading in terms of grade equivalent scores and Normal Curve Equivalents (NCE) for this component of the Title I Umbrella. Data are presented for 144 students. At all grades there are no significant differences between actual posttest and predicted posttest. However, there are statistical differences between pre and posttests at grades 2 and 3. (Tests of significance were not performed at all grade levels because of the size of the NS (i.e. they were under 30). In general,a review of the data, both G.E. scores and NCE's, does show growth for all subtests as well as total score. This growth was accomplished as a reading instruction. The program functioned for approximately 25 weeks with the children meeting the teacher about 2 times per week. Growth averaged anywhere from 5 months to 1.9 years.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The program was implemented as indicated in the Title I proposal. Diagnostic information was maintained for each student and information shared with the child's regular teacher.

TABLE 21

PRE & POSTTEST SAT-READING (G.E. SCORES) FOR THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM

Grade	N	Vocabulary Pre	Vocabulary Post	Vocabulary Growth	Comprehension Pre	Comprehension Post	Comprehension Growth	Word Study Skill Pre	Word Study Skill Post	Word Study Skill Growth	Total Pre	Total Post	Total Growth
2	37	1.6	2.2	+ .6	1.8	2.7	+ .9	2.0	3.1	+1.1	1.8	2.9	+1.1
3	29	2.0	3.0	+1.0	2.1	3.1	+1.0	2.2	3.2	+1.0	2.1	3.1	+1.0
4	15	2.4	3.6	+1.2	3.1	3.6	+ .5	3.4	4.8	+1.4	3.2	4.1	+ .9
5	30	3.0	4.2	+1.2	3.8	4.6	+ .8	3.1	4.6	+1.5	3.6	4.7	+ .9
6	8	4.1	6.6	+2.5	4.3	6.4	+2.1	4.8	6.2	+1.4	4.5	6.4	+1.9
7	12	5.7	5.8	+ .1	5.0	5.0	+1.0				5.0	5.5	+ .5
8	12	5.1	6.7	+1.6	4.8	6.5	+1.7				44.7	6.5	+1.8

TABLE 22

PRE & POSTTEST SAT-READING RESULTS (NCE) FOR NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM

Grade	N	Vocabulary Pre	Vocabulary Post	Comprehension Pre	Comprehension Post	Word Study Skill Pre	Word Study Skill Post	Total Pre	Total Post
2	37	39.4	42.7	40.3	48.3	32.9	53.0	41.0	49.5
3	29	33.1	38.4	36.8	40.7	20.6	41.0	35.4	40.1
4	15	30.5	37.2	37.3	33.8	43.5	46.3	39.3	30.0
5	30	25.9	33.9	37.3	39.6	36.0	44.1	35.3	41.2
6	8	25.1	46.0	31.4	45.8	40.8	46.2	35.1	45.6
7	12	39.8	37.5	34.4	34.3			35.6	35.2
8	12	33.0	36.8	31.0	35.7			30.6	34.6

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The program should be recycled next year.
2. All efforts should be made to service children 3 to 5 times per week.

Non-Public School Math Program - 5043-91630
Non-Public School ESL Program - 5043-91629

As indicated in the District 6 Title I Umbrella proposal, the evaluation of these components is to be included in the Central Umbrella Evaluation.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The data which are presented in this report are generalizations based on the aggregation of information across a number of different levels (i.e. individual students, groupings in classrooms, the classroom itself, individual teachers, etc.). The conclusions which are reached may or may not be applicable to a particular classroom, child or teacher. [illegible] evaluative conclusions can not pinpoint cause and effect relationships, the conclusions can only move us in a direction which seems feasible, based on the wide array of results; that is, only if the information and conclusions reached are relevant to the particular decision-maker's concerns. Thus, try to cull out generalized pieces of information which are relevant to your situation and then adopt a solution.

The data we have presented do adequately demonstrate that District 6 does have an effective Title I program both the elementary and JHS level. The District is able to provide an instructional program to children who are performing significantly below grade level expectations. This has been shown over and over again. However, the rank of the district in relation to the other 32 districts in the city has remained 24 or 25 over the past few years. In order for us to change this, one must, I think, transfer some of the teaching methodology used in the Title I program to the classroom environment. Although, there was a concerted effort, last year, to coordinate all of the efforts; this must be further stressed even more this year. The coordination has been handled in many ways to each of our schools--from formal conferences and demonstration lessons to designating the corrective reading teachers as the reading experts of the school. There is no one approach that has demonstrated superiority over the other; what is clear, however, is that "coordination" has been an administrative priority and should continue to be one if we are to improve the achievement of all children in the district.

SS